



,



·

1

ADV 15-13



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS DEPARTMENT RECEIVED

55.0

NOV 28 1994

Appendices To

# BOSTON'S NEW EXPOSITION CENTER AND STADIUM

Interim Report

October 1994

**Boston Redevelopment Authority** 

Revised and expanded October 18, 1994

John Avault Department of Policy Development and Research

The five technical appendices that follow differ slightly from those published as part of <u>BOSTON'S NEW EXPOSITION CENTER AND STADIUM</u>, Interim <u>Report</u>, released by Boston Mayor Thomas M. Menino and Chief Economic Development Officer Marisa Lago on October 12, 1994. The greatest difference is that all tables and charts that follow have been printed in a larger typeface, requiring more paper but causing less eye strain to the reader.

Appendix 2 has been expanded by the inclusion of an additional table on output, earnings, and employment originating from the on-site operations of the Exposition Center. Additional text describes this table and clarifies a few points about the use of economic multipliers.

Minor corrections have been made to the printing of some tables in Appendix4. These corrections do not in any way affect the conclusions of the report.

Appendices 3 and 4 were produced by Kairos Shen and Bob Baldwin.

Greg Perkins and Robert Amatruda contributed to Appendix 2.

·

APPENDIX	
Appendix 1:	Attendance Estimates for Exposition Center
Appendix 2:	Economic and Fiscal Impacts of Exposition Center: Construction Period, Year 2000
	and Year 2010
Appendix 3:	Development Cost Comparison of C Street and Northern Avenue sites
Appendix 4:	Cost/Benefit Analysis
Appendix 5:	Hotel Demand Related to Major Exposition Center Events

Note: The purpose of the analyses presented in the Appendices is to estimate the attendance, occupancy, spending, employment, taxes and influence on the hotel market of the proposed Exposition Center. These estimates are not intended to represent goals or targets. Neither are they a "best case" that may not be surpassed, nor a "worst case" that guarantees a minimum performance level. The estimates presented here are intended to summarize the economic performance that a prudent investor might anticipate, based on a thorough and cautious examination of relevant data. Our results point out the complexities of the exposition industry and the importance of government and business cooperation and planning in determining the economic results. This is especially important for the establishment or recruiting of permanent location professional association meetings and trade shows. Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2019 with funding from Boston Public Library

https://archive.org/details/bostonsnewexposi00bost

# APPENDIX I:

ATTENDANCE ESTIMATES FOR BOSTON'S NEW EXPOSITION CENTER

The issue of visitor attendance at Boston's new Exposition Center is central to both the determination of the optimal size of the facility and the estimation of the economic and fiscal benefits that will repay the public investment in construction cost and site opportunity cost. The first steps of this analysis are the identification of market segments among facility users and the determination of attendance and floor space relationships. These first steps involve the examination of national data on exposition events. The next steps are the identification of Boston's position in the national marketplace of exposition events and the estimation of actual attendance for relevant market segments. Once this has been done, the attendance estimates that result can serve as the starting point for the next analysis: Estimating the Economic and Fiscal Impacts of the Exposition Center, which is Appendix II.

#### **MARKET SEGMENTS:**

"Exposition events" are those meetings, conventions, demonstrations, trade shows, and exhibits that require the short-term use of a very large enclosed space. The most important division across these varied events divides the market into two segments: consumer shows and trade shows, as explained in the second chapter of the main report. Since consumer shows draw most of their attendance from the local metropolitan population, their economic impact is limited. They bring little new money into the regional economy from outside. Their usefulness and value is attested by the exhibitors and visitors that these events draw, but their economic impact is limited.

Trade shows and national meetings requiring significant exhibition space comprise the other major segment of exposition events. Many of these events are the annual meetings of professional or trade associations. Some are "conventions" that have evolved to include exhibits of the latest products or processes that are important to the profession or trade group that is meeting. In this sense, these conventions might properly be called "trade shows". Admission to these events is limited to business and professional groups whose members often travel from across the country to attend. Many attendees require hotel lodging, restaurant meals, and local stores and services during a stay that typically lasts three or four days. Even those attendees who live in the local metropolitan area may make some expenditures that represent "net new" economic stimulus to the state and regional economies. This is most likely to be the case when the expenditures are treated as business, rather than personal, expenses. It is this net new spending, particularly at hotels, that makes these events economically important. They bring new money into the local economy. This is the market segment that the following analysis focuses on, and it will be simply referred to as "trade shows" from this point on.

Some exposition events move to a different city each year, or rotate, while others return to the same place each year, as fixed or permanent events, as described in Chapter 2. This distinction is important to the attendance analysis because Boston's capture of market share in the fixed segment may take more time than is required by the rotating segment.

-2/ 1

### THE NATIONAL MARKET OF TRADESHOW EVENTS:

Most large exposition events in America are listed and described in the <u>1994 Tradeshow Week</u> <u>Databook</u>, which is the source principal of data in this section, unless otherwise noted.

The tradeshow industry has seen a trend of increasing use of exhibition space at large meetings as event planners incorporate more exhibitors and materials into their programs and respond to new space resources created by newly developed exhibition facilities. Still, there are few events that require an exhibition hall larger than half a million gross square feet.

The Number of *National Rotating Trade Shows* distributed by Gross Exhibition Size is illustrated in the following graph. The graph shows that there were 101 such events scheduled for 1994 that utilized between 100,000 and just under 200,000 gross square feet of exhibition space. These are events that would require all or almost all of the exhibition floor space available at the Hynes Veterans Memorial Convention Center, which has 193,000 square feet of total gross exhibition space. Even though the Hynes Center can accommodate shows of this size in theory, it is important to include them in our analysis since Boston may be losing some business in this range due to the Hynes' layout (only 111,000 sq. ft. contiguous) and tight schedule. One step above this are 42 shows using between 200,000 and 299,999 gross square feet, and above this are 30 shows at 300,000 to 399,999 square feet, followed by 20 more shows that need up to one half million square feet. After the 12 shows using 500,000 to just under 600,000 square feet (half of these 12 requiring just 500,000 to 510,000 square feet and the largest only 560,000 g.s.f.) the number of events drops to a low level and adds just 12 more events between 600,000 and over 1.9 million gross square feet of space.

Attendance and Space Utilization Rates, measured by Attendance per Thousand Gross Square Feet, also show an important pattern across the range of space requirements, as shown in the next graph. The number of persons attending these events, per thousand gross square feet of exhibition space, drops steadily from over 100 persons for floor space requirements between 100,000 and 199,999 square feet, through 20 for 400,000 to 499,999 square feet, to 12 for 700,000 to 799,999 square feet of gross exhibition square feet. Although the graph indicates a break in this pattern at around one million square feet, the more intensive space utilization rates seen here represent individual events, and not averages for several shows. "Large" shows that require very large halls sometimes owe their size to expansive exhibits rather than to great attendance. The largest trade show listed in the 1994 Tradeshow Week Databook is the California Farm Equipment Show and International Exposition.

Taken together, the patterns of declining numbers of events and declining space utilization for attendance across ever larger venues explain the result depicted in the graph: *National Demand for Exposition Space*, which measures total national rotating trade show attendance by gross exhibition size. The 101 trade shows using from 100,000 and up to 200,000 gross square feet of exhibition space have an average attendance to floor space ratio of 102 persons per thousand square feet, and represent a total of 654,450 attendees. The next step up in floor space requirements finds 429,200 persons attending national rotating trade shows utilizing from 200,000 up to 300,000 square feet. Attendance continues to decline across the next three size levels, reaching 203,000 for trade shows needing from 500,000 up to 600,000 square feet, and then dropping further and more steeply.















The fourth and final graph on this topic expresses these same figures in a different way to help us visualize the schedule by which an expanding exposition center can accommodate an increasingly large market of trade show attendees. Potential Attendance and Facility Size in the national market of rotating trade shows the cumulative growth in potential attendance for a exposition center that may be imagined to grow larger and larger by 100,000 gross square foot increments, beginning at just under 100,000 square feet. The first expansion, from 99,999 square feet to just short of 200,000 square feet, establishes the first point on the graph, marking the 654,450 persons expected to attend national rotating trade shows in this size range in 1994. The second expansion, up to 300,000 square feet, adds another 429,200 persons and brings the count of total potential attendees up to nearly 1.1 million persons. Cumulative potential attendance continues to rise steeply over the next two conceptual expansions, up to 500,000 square feet of gross exhibition space. Attendance increases then decelerate somewhat up to the 600,000 square feet level, at which point nearly two million attendees have been added to potential market available. Potential attendance growth then slows substantially beyond this level, rising by only another 179,000 over the next four size increments that bring the gross exposition space up to one million square feet.

This suggests that the range of 500,000 to 600,000 gross square feet of exhibition space may be an efficient size for Boston's new Exposition Center, especially if prime site opportunities are limited and development costs are expensive.

# **ROTATING VS. PERMANENT SHOWS:**

While "Only 15% of the shows listed in Tradeshow Week Data Book relocate each year."(1994 Tradeshow Week Data Book, p.VIII), this "15% rotate" rule is a broad average that does not apply to the national trade shows that we are most concerned with. Almost all consumer shows are permanently located. They cannot rotate to different locations because they are designed to market products to a local population. This means that about 30% of trade shows rotate. True trade shows (admission restricted to members or professionals) number about half of Tradeshow Week Data Book listings.)

Examining the listings for large shows in the 1994 Data Book reveals:

Gross Sq. Ft.	Total Trade Shows	Rotating	Rotating %
200,000-380,000	143	73	51%
400,000-460,000	32	17	53%
470,000-600,000	45	18	40%
200,000-600,000	220	108	49%

Above 600,000 g.s.f. only 9 out of 30 (30%) rotate.

The market realities that these figures reflect are:

A) Larger shows tend to be truly national, and as such must rotate to meet the desires of members/attendees for both convenience and travel.

B) The largest shows have trouble rotating because of the scarcity of adequate venues and problems of logistics.

C) Many smaller shows are local or regional and do not have as much member pressure to rotate.

, •

Non-rotating trade shows are not necessarily permanently fixed in their present location.

A) A show with no essential link to its present venue may relocate in response to new options (such as a new Boston facility of adequate size and quality).

B) A show may "metamorphose" through growth, sale, or member or management changes. This may be accompanied by a move to a new "permanent" location and perhaps a new name.

C) New shows are always being created or terminated, as well as transformed.

#### **CONCLUSIONS:**

National trade shows are the sub-market of exposition events that bring significant economic benefits to the host city and region by providing new opportunities for the "export" of hospitality and related services to visitors who inject new money into the local economy. Rotating trade shows constitute the most accessible part of this market but represent only half of all events in the size strata relevant to Boston's new Exposition Center. Estimates of attendance at economically significant shows should account for the inevitable and gradual evolution of large non-rotating trade shows in Boston's proposed new facility.

# THE SHARE AND SIZE OF BOSTON'S TRADE SHOW MARKET:

The question of Boston's potential share of the national market of large rotating trade shows has been addressed by studies investigating the feasibility of a new exposition center. These studies by the firms Price Waterhouse and Coopers & Lybrand have been referred to in the first chapter of this report. Applying market share results determined through a survey conducted by Coopers & Lybrand to the picture of the national market described above, the following analysis estimates likely attendance at large rotating trade shows in Boston. Similar, but more conservative, parameters for the extent and timing of penetration into the market of fixed location shows complete the analysis of the national trade show market for Boston. The results concur with the general conclusions of these two earlier studies: that a moderately large exposition center in Boston could attract a significant number of new visitors to the city, and that the facility can attain an acceptably high occupancy rate.

# **RESULTS**:

Attendance estimates begin with rotating trade shows. After rotating trade show attendance has been established for the 1994 base year, market and attendance growth are factored in to arrive at estimates for the anticipated first full year of operations, the year 2000. Finally, Boston's market share of fixed location or non-rotating shows is established along with a schedule for the gradual establishment of this sub-market, and attendance at fixed location events is factored into the total.

# ROTATING TRADE SHOWS:

1) Cumulative national attendance at (1994) rotating events	
using 200,000-560,000 g.s.f. (104 events)=	1,297,373
2) Times a factor representing Boston's market share	
of large rotating trade shows	x .085

3) Equals annual average attendance at 9 rotating events which



Hynes is too small to host.	=110,277
4) Plus attendance at 2 additional shows that require between	
100,000-200,000 g.s.f. (Hynes maximum capacity)	+ 12,960
5) Yields a total "1994" Boston attendance at rotating trade shows	
that require a facility larger than Hynes	=123,237
6) Now allow for 6 years of 4% annually compounded growth	x 1.265
7) To arrive at estimated attendance at net new rotating	
trade shows at the proposed new exposition center	=155,934
for the operating year 2000.	

NOTES to the estimation of rotating trade show attendance:

1) Although the data have been presented in terms of 100,000 square foot increments, actual events falling within this largest stratum of 500,000 to 599,999 g.s.f. did not exceed 560,000. Furthermore, the real limiting factor determining the adequacy of a facility to accommodate large trade shows is its <u>net</u> square footage. A well designed and configured hall may attain an efficiency factor greater than the standard 50% ratio of net to gross space. Consequently, an exposition space of 550,000 gross square feet can suffice for events that might otherwise require up to 600,000 g.s.f.

2) The survey of potential exposition center event representatives conducted by Coopers & Lybrand concluded that Massachusetts falls within the rotation region for events larger than 200,000 g.s.f. on an average four year cycle. This survey further concluded that Boston might capture 34% of those events cycling within this region. Dividing this 34% by the 4 year rotation cycle yields the .085 market share factor.

4) Additional attendance at events requiring Hynes' full capacity:

Since Hynes has only 111,000 g.s.f. of contiguous space available, the possibility exists that the lower utility of non-contiguous space and the inability to "double book" full facility shows may pose an effective constraint that prevents Boston from realizing its full share of business in this size range. This does in fact appear to be the case. The Coopers & Lybrand users survey referred to above indicated that shows requiring 50,001-100,000 n.s.f. (100,002-200,000 g.s.f.) observe a 6 year rotation to our region with a 35% preference for Boston within the region. This would indicate that Boston could host 35%/6 = 5.8% of the 101 rotating shows in this size category, or 6 shows. In fact, Boston was recorded as hosting only 4 such shows. We assume that an ample size new facility would allow for the capture of these two additional shows. Average attendance at these 101 shows in 1994 was 6,480.

6) This 4% growth rate is more conservative than some other estimates but still greater than some other reference benchmarks. Price Waterhouse (op. cit.) assumed a 6% annual growth in floor space demand, citing Tradeshow Week surveys that called for 5% growth annually in attendance and floor space demand for exposition events overall. Between 1984 and 1993 professional attendance at the "Tradeshow 200" largest shows grew by an average 3.4% annually, as reported by Tradeshow Week. For one reference point outside of the tradeshow industry, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor projects 1.6% annual growth in national employment through the year 2005. If both the 4% growth in tradeshow attendance and the 1.6% growth in national employment hold true through the year 2010 when Boston's new Exposition Center reaches full capacity utilization, the ratio of tradeshow attendance to total employment will be 45% greater than it is today. This result does not seem unreasonable in view of the growing use of exhibition space for conventions and meetings and the growth of tradeshow activities in response to the availability of newly developed space. If there is no growth



.

in tradeshow attendance after the year 2010, the results of the present analysis will not be affected.

#### FIXED LOCATION OR NON-ROTATING TRADE SHOWS:

The other important segment of the national trade show market consists of "fixed" shows that will establish, relocate or grow into Boston.

Since this market will develop over time, as related in the section: "The National Market of Tradeshow Events" above, its simulation must allow for phased growth. The larger shows will need some time to plan and implement a Boston location, so we allow 15 years for this market to expand at a constant, non-compound rate. This 15 years will begin in 1995 with the announcement of exposition hall construction. By the year 2000, Boston will have gained one third (5 years/15 years) of its potential national market, adjusted for market growth.

While these estimates have adopted the 8.5% national market share for large rotating trade shows that Coopers and Lybrand derived from their user survey, it would be prudent to estimate fixed shows more conservatively. After Boston and other cities complete current or planned expansions, Boston's new hall will be one of 18 able to provide at least 500,000 g.s.f. of exhibition space, and one of 42 with over 200,000 g.s.f. Boston's share of national attendance at non-rotating shows may also be hindered by our non-central geography, Frost-Belt location, and high costs. Five percent seems reasonable, reflecting both the growing competition in the exposition center supply market and Boston's exceptional attractiveness to visitors.

The attendance characteristics of permanent shows are similar to those of rotating shows and many fixed shows evolve from rotating events. Their estimated attendance may be calculated by reference to the results for rotating shows outlined above.

The national market of fixed shows is slightly			
greater than that of rotating shows.			
(51% compared to 49%) 51 / 49 =	1.	04	
Boston's market share, 15 years after the announcement			
of project plans will be 5%, compared to a			
8.5% share of rotating events.	X	5/8	3.5
Combining these two factors, we get the attendance			
ratio for permanent shows/rotating shows	=	6	1%
Multiplying growth-adjusted year 2000 attendance			
at rotating shows by this factor	Х	155	,934
Results in year 2000 attendance at Boston's full			
"equilibrium share" of national fixed shows	Ξ	95,	120
But by year 2000 Boston is just one third through the			
15 year maturity that began in 1995	X	1	/3
So that Boston's year 2000 attendance at non-rotating trade	<b>;</b>		
shows will be	=	31,	707

P ,

#### TOTAL ATTENDANCE:

Year 2000:	Rotating 155,934	Permanent 31,707	TOTAL 187,641	
Year 2005	189,718	77,152	266,870	
Year 2010	230,820	140,800	371,621	

Total potential attendance during the year 2000 at net new national trade shows that might take place in Boston's new Exposition Center is depicted in the following graph: *Boston Exposition Attendance*. The graph illustrates the relationship between the size of gross exposition space at Boston's new Exposition Center and the estimated net increase in national trade show attendance beyond the level now achieved by the Hynes Convention Center.





APPENDIX II:

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACTS OF BOSTON'S NEW EXPOSITION CENTER: CONSTRUCTION PERIOD, YEAR 2000 AND YEAR 2010

.

,

.

# ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACTS OF THE OPERATION OF BOSTON'S NEW EXPOSITION CENTER:

Exposition and convention centers are widely regarded as economic engines that bring new money into local economies by increasing the "export" of hotel and visitor services to delegates and attendees to national and regional events. As with most economic stimuli that inject new money from outside the local economy, the spending by visiting attendees is believed to have a "multiplier effect" as new local wages and business receipts are re-spent on both business and consumer goods and services. This total new income, spending, and business generates new state and local taxes, so that the public investment in construction, operation, and site opportunity cost may be repaid. The tables that follow explore these issues for the proposed new Boston Exposition Center.

The first question in estimating the economic and fiscal impacts of exposition center operations is: "If you build it, who will come?" This was the topic of Appendix I. The next issue is the amount and type of spending that can be expected from these visitors. In order to have a positive economic effect, this spending must be made with "net new" money that would not have been spent without the exposition center. For this reason, the attendance estimates focused on out-oftown visitors who would not have been in Boston to patronize hotels and buy other local services and goods if it were not for the event being staged at the exposition center. Local residents who might attend "consumer shows" were not included in the attendance analysis because of the presumption that any spending that they do in conjunction with exposition events will be offset by reductions in other local expenditures. Local residents' spending will not be "net new", but will be redirected from other local purchases.

The table: *Economic Impact of Boston's New Exposition Center with 187,641 Delegates in Year 2000* shows the projected spending by national trade show attendees during the Center's first full year of operation. The figures in the top section of the table show the distribution and amount of total spending by each out-of-town visitor to a national trade show who spends the average 3.2 nights in a Boston hotel. The average delegate staying in a hotel will spend \$728 during their stay. The "total delegate spending" column sums the spending of all those 70% of attendees who are presumed to come from outside of the metropolitan area and stay in a local hotel. In addition, this total delegate spending column includes the amounts that would be spent by half of that 30% of attendees who do not stay at a hotel, but nonetheless make all other expenditures listed. Since these local attendees are professional or trade people making business expenditures, their spending here will not necessarily be offset with reduced personal spending elsewhere in the local economy, and this spending will count as "net new".

The bottom of this *Economic Impact...* table calculates the taxes that will be collected as this spending takes place. Most dollar figures are shown in constant dollars at 1994 prices; they are not adjusted to account for anticipated future inflation. Calculated tax receipts are presented in both constant dollar and current dollar (inflated) terms since the actual dollar amounts are relevant to budget matters such as construction bond repayment. Inflation is assumed to average 3% annually through the year 2000. A similar table presents these same results calculated for the year 2010, when Exposition Center occupancy and attendance are projected to reach capacity. Since most of this table is also expressed in 1994 constant dollars, these two tables differ only because of the greater number of visitors in 2010 and of course the inflated tax receipts have been subject to a longer period of inflation. Inflation is assumed to average 5% per year after the year 2000, which is close to the long term national average.

These *Economic Impact...* tables also incorporate the effects of the local multiplier in estimating total economic output and indirect tax revenues. Direct tax revenues are those collected at the

. . . ,

time that the exposition visitor makes his or her purchase, and this money comes from among those net new dollars that the attendee has brought to this event. Indirect tax revenues include the income and sales taxes that hotel workers and others serving or doing business with these visitors pay from their paychecks, which in turn come indirectly from this same attendee spending. Indirect taxes also include higher corporate tax collections as corporations enjoying this new delegate business make higher profits and pay higher taxes on these earnings. Additionally, indirect taxes contain the sales, income, and business taxes that result as wages and business receipts are spent and re-spent in the local economy. For example, hotels will purchase more contract services and supplies in the course of hosting their additional guests. Hotel workers will spend much of their paychecks locally, providing income to local stores and craftsmen.

The multipliers used for these calculations are published by the U.S. Dept. of Commerce, and they reflect the re-spending effects within the state of Massachusetts. The tables *Estimating Total Economic Impacts using Regional Multipliers*... describe this in detail. Please note that the total output, earnings, and employment recorded in these tables under the banner "Total Impact on Full Economy by Sector of Origin" refer to the sector where these jobs etc. originate, and not where they reside. For example, the tables show that about half of the total new jobs throughout the entire state economy derive from the initial spending made at hotels. This does not mean that half of all new jobs will be hotel workers. The jobs that originate with initial spending at hotels also include those whose customers are hotel businesses and hotel workers.

The employment, output, earnings, and tax collections that will flow both directly and indirectly from the off-site spending of new visitors to Boston's new Exposition Center have been shown in these first four tables just examined. These tables have provided snap shots for the year 2000, the first year of full operations, and for the year 2010, the first year of full occupancy. The table *BOSTON EXPOSITION CENTER ANNUAL PERFORMANCE and OFF-SITE TAX GENERATION* fills in attendance, occupancy, and tax collections for the intervening years. Taxes shown include all elastic taxes: hotel occupancy (both state and municipal), and state income, sales, and corporate tax levies. Potential property taxes from new hotels that might be built in response to increased demand from Exposition Center visitors is not included.

In addition to the off-site spending of Exposition Center visitors that has been the subject of the preceding analysis, the operation of the Exposition Center itself will produce jobs and income, both directly and indirectly. This is examined in the table: *EMPLOYMENT, ECONOMIC, AND FISCAL BENEFITS OF EXPOSITION CENTER OPERATIONS*. With wages and other employee compensation costing about \$9.06 (again, 1994 constant dollars) per square foot of gross exposition space (Coopers & Lybrand, op. cit.), the proposed 550,000 g.s.f. Exposition Center would have an employee compensation cost of nearly \$5 million for its first full year of operations in year 2000. This might be distributed among 200 or so full and part-time employees receiving an average of \$19,932 in annual pay and another \$4,983 in other compensation or benefits. The state income and sales tax returns to the state from this direct on-site income would be about \$237,769. The output of the Exposition Center, measured as its annual expenses of operation, is the starting point for estimating the multiplier effect, as shown in the bottom half of this table. After the initial year, employment is presumed to increase somewhat in partial response to increasing occupancy, as shown in the tables of Appendix IV.

The construction of the Exposition Center itself will also provide jobs and income to area construction workers, architects, etc.; and the spending and re-spending of their earnings will also generate a multiplier effect. Similarly, the construction of new hotels built in response to new trade show guests will boost construction jobs and earnings. And, of course, additional state tax collections follow quickly behind these new earnings. The last tables in this Appendix describe these economic and fiscal benefits of construction.

,

•
#### Economic Impact of Boston's New Exposition Center with 187,641 Delegates in Year 2000

Taxaa

All amounts in Constant Dollars at 1994 price levels unless otherwise noted.

		She	enuing
			Year 2000
Spending Category	Percent	Per	Total Delegate
	Share	Visitor	Spending
Hotel Room Lodging	51.0%	\$371.55	\$48,802,872
Hotel Restaurants	11.0%	\$80.14	\$12,781,705
Other Restaurants	11.4%	\$83.05	\$13,246,494
Hospitality Suites	5.2%	\$37.88	\$6,042,260
Entertainment	5.0%	\$36.43	\$5,809,866
Retail Stores *	8.2%	\$59.74	\$9,528,180
Local Transportation	4.3%	\$31.33	\$4,996,485
Other	3.9%	\$28.41	\$4,531,695
Total Direct Spending	100.0%	\$728.53	\$105,739,556
Multiplier			1.9631
Total Direct and Indirect			
Economic Output			\$193 553 312

Spending Category

opending category			Taxes	
		Tax Rate	\$1994\$ Dollars	2000\$ Dollars **
Hotel Room Lodging	State	5.7%	\$2,781,764	\$3,321,571
	Local	4.0%	\$1,952,115	\$2,330,927
Hotel Restaurants		5.0%	\$639,085	\$763,101
Other Restaurants		5.0%	\$662,325	\$790,850
Hospitality Suites	State	5.7%	\$344,409	\$411,242
	Local	4.0%	\$241,690	\$288,591
Entertainment	•	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Retail Stores		5.0%	\$476,409	\$568,857
Local Transportation		0.0%	\$0	\$0
Other		0.0%	\$0	\$0
Total Direct Tax Revenue	Total		\$7,097,797	\$8,475,141
	State		\$4,903,991	\$5,855,622
	City		\$2,193,805	\$2,619,518
Indirect Taxes			2	
Income Tax			\$2,921,826	\$3,488,814
Corporate Tax			\$685,064	\$818,002
Sales Tax			\$694,157	\$828,860
Total Direct and Indirect				
Tax Revenue			\$11,398,844	\$13,610,816

Sources:

1

Percent spending for out-of-town visitors is based upon a survey by the International Association of Convention & Visitors Bureaus. Visitor spending is estimated by the Boston Redevelopment Authority using this percent spending and a daily hotel rate of \$116.11 Number of attendees is based on 13 events with an average crowd of 14,440.

Out-of-town visitors are assumed to be 70 % of the total and stay an average of 3.2 nights at hotels, making all expenditures shown An additional 15 percent of all visitors make all non-lodging expenditures, which are also net increments to the state economy. See the table: "ESTIMATING TOTAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS USING REGIONAL MULTIPLIERS" for notes on the multiplier

and the estimation of "Indirect Taxes".

\* Only the 25% of retail sales volume that is "margin" enters into the multiplier effect. The wholesale cost of goods is excluded. \*\*Tax yields inflated to year 2000 level assuming six years of 3% annual inflation (19.4%).

#### **OMPACT9.XLS**



#### Economic Impact of Boston's New Exposition Center with 371,621 Delegates in Year 2010

Taxes

All amounts in Constant Dollars at 1994 price levels unless otherwise noted.

	_	She	ending
			Year 2010
Spending Category	Percent	Per	Total Delegate
	Share	Visitor	Spending
Hotel Room Lodging	51.0%	\$371.55	\$96,653,568
Hotel Restaurants	11.0%	\$80.14	\$25,314,030
Other Restaurants	11.4%	\$83.05	\$26,234,540
Hospitality Suites	5.2%	\$37.88	\$11,966,632
Entertainment	5.0%	\$36.43	\$11,506,377
Retail Stores *	8.2%	\$59.74	\$18,870,459
Local Transportation	4.3%	\$31.33	\$9,895,484
Other	3.9%	\$28.41	\$8,974,974
Total Direct Spending	100.0%	\$728.53	\$209,416,064
Multiplier			1.9631
Total Direct and Indirect			
Economic Output			\$383.330.272

#### Spending Category

		Tax Rate	\$1994\$ Dollars	2010\$ Dollars **
Hotel Room Lodging	State	5.7%	\$5,509,253	\$10,715,417
	Local	4.0%	\$3,866,143	\$7,519,591
Hotel Restaurants		5.0%	\$1,265,701	\$2,461,771
Other Restaurants		5.0%	\$1,311,727	\$2,551,290
Hospitality Suites	State	5.7%	\$682,098	\$1,326,671
	Local	4.0%	\$478,665	\$930,997
Entertainment		0.0%	\$0	\$0
Retail Stores		5.0%	\$943,523	\$1,835,138
Local Transportation		0.0%	\$0	\$0
Other		0.0%	\$0	\$0
Total Direct Tax Revenue	Total		\$14,057,111	\$27,340,875
	State		\$9,712,303	\$18,890,287
	City		\$4,344,808	\$8,450,588
Indirect Taxes				
Income Tax			\$5,786,646	\$11,254,942
Corporate Tax			\$1,356,761	\$2,638,880
Sales Tax			\$1,374,771	\$2,673,910
Total Direct and Indirect				
Tax Revenue			\$22,575,289	\$43,908,607

#### Sources:

Percent spending for out-of-town visitors is based upon a survey by the International Association of Convention & Visitors Bureaus. Visitor spending is estimated by the Boston Redevelopment Authority using this percent spending and a daily hotel rate of \$116.11. Number of attendees is based on 25 events with an average crowd of 14,865.

Out-of-town visitors are assumed to be 70 % of the total and stay an average of 3.2 nights at hotels, making all expenditures shown. An additional 15 percent of all visitors make all non-lodging expenditures, which are also net increments to the state economy. See the table: "ESTIMATING TOTAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS USING REGIONAL MULTIPLIERS" for notes on the multiplier

and the estimation of "Indirect Taxes".

\* Only the 25% of retail sales volume that is "margin" enters into the multiplier effect. The wholesale cost of goods is excluded. \*\*Tax yields inflated to year 2010 level assuming six years of 3% annual inflation 1994-2000 and then 5% annually to 2000 (94.5%)

#### OMPACT9B.XLS



ESTIMATING TOTAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS USING REGIONAL MULTIPLIERS FOR YEAR 2000 Annual Off-Site Business Attributable to the Boston's New Exposition Center

		Initial Impact		Multipliers		Total Impa	ct on Full Econ	omy
		Year 2000			\$1994\$	by Sec	tor of Origin	•
spending Category	Percent	187,641 Delegates	Output	Eamings	Employment	Total	Total	Total
	<u>Share</u>	Spending	<u>Mult.</u>	<u>Mult.</u>	Mult.	Output	Earnings	Employment
lotel Room Lodging	0.510	\$48,802,872	1.9709	0.5970	29.5597	\$96,185,581	\$29,135,315	1.443
lotel Restaurants	0.110	\$12,781,705	1.9198	0.5809	32.9208	\$24,538,317	\$7,424,892	421
Other Restaurants	0.114	\$13,246,494	1.9198	0.5809	32.9208	\$25,430,619	\$7,694,888	436
Iospitality Suites	0.052	\$6,042,260	1.9709	0.5970	29.5597	\$11,908,691	\$3,607,229	179
intertainment	0 050	\$5,809,866	1.9709	0.5970	29.5597	\$11,450,664	\$3,468,490	172
<pre>tetail Stores*</pre>	0 082	\$9,528,180 *	2.0819	0.8088	36.9712	\$4,959,179	\$1,926,598	88
ocal Transportation	0.043	\$4,996,485	1.9510	0.7573	26.3711	\$9,748,141	\$3,783,838	132
Other	0 039	\$4,531,695	2.0593	0.7900	39.6428	\$9,332,120	\$3,580,039	180
otal Direct Spending	1.000	\$105,739,556				-		2
otal Direct Economic Output*		\$98,593,422 *						
Composite Multiplier **			1.9631	0.6149	30.9280			
otal Direct and Indirect						\$193,553,312	\$60,621,289	3.049
Economic Impact							•	-

NOTE: Initial Impact Spending refers to hotel and other off-site spending by the 70% of attendees making all expenditures and the 15% of attendees making only non-lodging expenditures, all incremental net gains to the state economy. Operations of the Exposition Center itself are not included

Only the 25% of Retail sales representing "margin" enters into the multipliers as "Direct Output". The wholesale cost of goods, trucking, etc. are "leakages from the system" that do not generate a local multiplier effect.

\*\*\*Composite Multipliers" are derived by dividing Total Impacts for each column by Direct Output.

MULTIPLIERS: A User Handbook for the Regional Input-Output Modeling System (RIMS II), Second Edition, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, May 1992.) All multipliers are Total Multipliers, by Industry Aggregation, for Output, Earnings, and Employment, for the state of Massachusetts. (REGIONAL

The RIMS II Employment multiplier is expressed in terms of 1989 constant dollars in the 1992 Handbook. The employment multipliers shown on this table have been adjusted to 1994 price terms using the 1989-1994 U.S. fixed weight GDP deflator of 0.8618.

provide a key to total taxes collected after all initial, indirect, and induced effects have been realized. State income taxes produced by total earnings will be equal to the portion of earnings that is taxable after all exemptions and deductions (81% of gross income, on average, according to the Mass, None of these multipliers will directly show the relationship between initial impact and total impact TAXES. However, the Earnings Multiplier does he portion of earnings spent on taxable goods (22.9% of household income, as seen in theU.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Expenditure Dept. of Revenue) times the personal income tax rate of 5.95%. Sales taxes paid out of earnings spent will be the 5% Mass. sales tax rate times Survey). Massachusetts state corporate revenues have averaged 1.13% of earned income over the long run. TIMPACO2.WQ1 10.5.94/JA] **\*** 

ESTIMATING TOTAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS USING REGIONAL MULTIPLIERS for YEAR 2010 Annual Business Attributable to the Boston's NewExposition Center (\$1994\$ Constant Dollars)

			-	<b>Multipliers</b>		Total Impa	act on Full Econ	omy
		Year 2010			\$1994\$	by Sec	ctor of Origin	
pending Category	Percent	371,621 Delegate	Output	Earnings	Employment	Total	Total	Total
	Share	Spending	Mult.	<u>Mult.</u>	Mult.	Output	Earnings	Employment
fotel Room Lodging	0.510	\$96,653,568	1.9709	0.5970	29.5597	\$190,494,517	\$57,702,180	2,857
fotel Restaurants	0.110	\$25,314,030	1.9198	0.5809	32.9208	\$48,597,874	\$14,704,920	833
Other Restaurants	0.114	\$26,234,540	1.9198	0.5809	32.9208	\$50,365,070	\$15,239,644	864
fospitality Suites	0.052	\$11,966,632	1.9709	0.5970	29.5597	\$23,585,035	\$7,144,079	354
intertainment	0.050	\$11,506,377	1.9709	0.5970	29.5597	\$22,677,919	\$6,869,307	340
tetail Stores*	0.082	\$18,870,459 *	2.0819	0.8088	36.9712	\$9,821,602	\$3,815,607	174
ocal Transportation	0.043	\$9,895,484	1.9510	0.7573	26.3711	\$19,306,090	\$7,493,850	261
Other	0.039	\$8,974,974	2.0593	0.7900	39.6428	\$18,482,164	\$7,090,230	356
otal Direct Spending	1.000	\$209,416,064				•	-	•
otal Direct Economic Output*		\$195,263,220 *						
Composite Multiplier **			1.9631	0.6149	30.9280			
otal Direct and Indirect						\$383,330,272	\$120,059,817	6,039
Economic Impact								

NOTE: Initial Impact Spending refers to hotel and other off-site spending by the 70% of attendees making all expenditures and the 15% of attendees making only non-lodging expenditures, all incremental net gains to the state economy. Operations of the Exposition Center itself are not included. Only the 25% of Retail sales representing "margin" enters into the multipliers as "Direct Output". The wholesale cost of goods, trucking, etc. are "leakages from the system" that do not generate a local multiplier effect.

\*\*"Composite Multipliers" are derived by dividing Total Impacts for each column by Direct Output.

MULTIPLIERS: A User Handbook for the Regional Input-Output Modeling System (RIMS II), Second Edition, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, May 1992. All multipliers are Total Multipliers, by Industry Aggregation, for Output, Earnings, and Employment, for the state of Massachusetts. (REGIONAL

The RIMS II Employment multiplier is expressed in terms of 1989 constant dollars in the 1992 Handbook. The employment multipliers shown on this table have been adjusted to 1994 price terms using the 1989-1994 U.S. fixed weight GDP deflator of 0.8618.

provide a key to total taxes collected after all initial, indirect, and induced effects have been realized. State income taxes produced by total earnings will be equal to the portion of earnings that is taxable after all exemptions and deductions (81% of gross income, on average, according to the Mass. None of these multipliers will directly show the relationship between initial impact and total impact TAXES. However, the Earnings Multiplier does the portion of earnings spent on taxable goods (22.9% of household income, as seen in theU.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Expenditure Dept. of Revenue) times the personal income tax rate of 5.95%. Sales taxes paid out of earnings spent will be the 5% Mass. sales tax rate times Survey). Massachusetts state corporate revenues have averaged 1.13% of earned income over the long run. ,

BOSTON EXPOSITION CENTER ANNUAL PERFORMANCE and OFF-SITE TAX GENERATION

_	ATT	ENDANC	<u>E</u>	OCCUPAN	CY	TAXE	S
Year	Rotating	Fixed	TOTAL	Occ.Sq.Ft.Days	Rate	<u>\$1994\$</u>	Inflated
2000	155,934	31,707	187,641	46,450,000	26%	\$11,398,844	\$13,610,816
2001	162,171	39,570	201,742	49,940,588	28%	\$12,255,435	\$15,365,312
2002	168,658	48,012	216,670	53,636,102	30%	\$13,162,316	\$17,327,434
2003	175,405	57,066	232,470	57,547,353	33%	\$14,122,138	\$19,520,534
2004	182,421	66,767	249,188	61,685,686	35%	\$15,137,686	\$21,970,505
2005	189,718	77,153	266,870	66,063,010	38%	\$16,211,882	\$24,706,049
2006	197,306	88,263	285,569	70,691,822	40%	\$17,347,795	\$27,758,974
2007	205,199	100,138	305,337	75,585,239	43%	\$18,548,640	\$31,164,526
2008	213,406	112,822	326,229	80,757,023	46%	\$19,817,798	\$34,961,747
2009	221,943	126,361	348,304	86,221,612	49%	\$21,158,810	\$39,193,881
2010	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$43,908,575
2011	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$46,104,004
2012	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$48,409,204
2013	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$50,829,664
2014	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$53,371,147
2015	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$56,039,704
2016	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$58,841,690
2017	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$61,783,774
2018	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$64,872,963
2019	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$68,116,611
2020	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$71,522,442
2021	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$75,098,564
2022	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$78,853,492
2023	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$82,796,166
2024	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$86,935,975
2025	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$91,282,774
2026	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$95,846,912
2027	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$100,639,258
2028	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$105,671,221
2029	230,820	140,802	371,621	91,993,663	52%	\$22,575,273	\$110,954,782

FOTAL5,334,4662,859,8948,194,330

\$497,790,431 \$1,697,458,697

NOTE: Occupancy includes major national/regional trade shows ONLY, both rotating and fixed location. Consumer shows attended by local residents are not included in these figures. Occupancy rates are calculated against the standard of a 320 day full occupancy year. Inflation is assumed to average 3%/yr. 1994-2000 and 5% thereafter.

3IGBXNPX.WQ1 10.14.94/JA



On-Site Jobs, Wages, Taxes
EMPLOYMENT, ECONOMIC, AND FISCAL BENEFITS of EXPOSITION CENTER OPERATIONS

		\$1	1994	4\$	\$2000\$ inflated		
DIRECT ON-SITE:	A	VERAGE		TOTAL			
Wages/gsf (\$1994\$)	\$	9.06			\$ 10.82		
GSF				550,000			
Total Wages (\$1994)			\$	4,983,000	\$ 5,949,963		
Number Jobs				200			
Total Compensation	\$	24,915	\$	4,983,000	\$ 29,750	\$	5,949,963
Pay (80%)	\$	19,932	\$	3,986,400	\$ 23,800	\$	4,759,970
Benefits (20%)	\$	4,983	\$	996,600	\$ 5,950	\$	1,189,993
Income Tax	\$	961	\$	192,125	\$ 1,147	\$	229,407
Sales Tax	\$	228	\$	45,644	\$ 273	\$	54,502
TOTAL Tax from On-Site Wage	\$	1,189	\$	237,769	\$ 1,420	\$	283,908

INDIRECT from ON-SITE		YEAR 2000	OP	ERATIONS	(all a	amounts \$20	00\$ inf	lated)
OPERATIONS:		<u>Output</u>		Earnings		<u>Jobs</u>	Mean	Earnings
Initial Output (Expenses):	\$	19,326,000	\$	19,326,000	\$	19,326,000		
Multiplier *		1.9709		0.597		24.8		
Total Impact	\$	38,089,613	\$	11,537,622		478	\$	24,116
Excluding Initial	\$	19,326,000	\$	4,759,970		200		
= Indirect	\$	18,763,613	\$	6,777,652	\$	278	\$	24,344
Taxes from Indirect:	Inc	ome	\$	326,649				
	Sa	les	\$	77,604				
	Со	rporate	\$	76,587			,	
	то	TAL	\$	480,841				

#### TOTAL YEAR 2000 STATE TAXES FROM EXPOSITION CENTER ANNUAL OPERATIONS:

Direct	\$ 283,908
Indirect	\$ 480,841
TOTAL	\$ 764,749

\* Multipliers used are those for hotels, lodging places, and amusements; RIMS II, op.cit.

. •

BOXBENIG.XLS



Exposition Center and Parking Foundation Infrastructure: New and Relocations	25 percent of hard costs full-time-equivalent, year-long, averaging \$35,000	<ol> <li>5 percent tax on materials does not apply to public projects</li> <li>5.95 percent tax on 81percent of payroll (Mass. Dept. Revenue, Statistics of In</li> <li>5 percent sales tax on the 22.9 percent of worker income spent on taxable item (U.S. Dept. of Labor, B.L.S., Boston Metro Consumer Expenditure Survey)</li> <li>Mass. corporate tax revenues average 1.13 percent of earned income annually</li> </ol>	Full time and part time jobs, including direct construction jobs Includes construction workers, suplier companies, and those they support through their spending. (Average earnings \$29,843) 75% of "Soft Costs" are assumed to be locally produced business and professi services, creating both direct and indirect jobs, earnings, and taxes.	Taxes calculated as above, all Economic Multipliers are from the U.S. Dept. Commerce "RIMS II" Handbook. The employment multiplier has been adjusted from \$1989 to \$1994 using the U.S. implicit price deflator for fixed weight G.D.P. (.8618)	One time, over the four year construction period
\$271,809,500 \$43,930,100 \$2,150,000 \$317,889,600 \$51,857,900 \$68,221,500 \$437,969,000	* \$79,472,400 2,271	\$0 \$3,830,172 \$909,959 \$898,038 \$5,638,169	and Taxes: 7,397 \$220,742,538 1,461 \$34,521,804	\$12,302,465 \$2,922,777 \$2,884,487	\$18,109,729
Construction Costs (\$000s at 1994 prices): Convention Center at C Street Site Total Hard Costs Soft Costs (business/professional service Acquisition, business relocation, continge Total Development Cost	Construction jobs and wages Payroll (\$000s): Jobs	Massachusetts State Taxes: Construction materials Construction Worker payroll Worker spending sales tax Corporate Tax Total Direct State Taxes from "Hard Cost	Direct plus Indirect Employment, Earnings, a Related to Hard Construction Costs: Total Impact employment Total Impact earnings Related to "Soft Cost" Business Services: Total Impact employment Total Impact earnings	Total Impact: Income tax sales tax corporate tax	Total Direct and Indirect State Taxes

.

Employment and Fiscal Benefits Generated by the Construction of Exposition Center

Source Boston Redevelopment Authority Research Department

## MEGACON8.XLS



Exclusive of site value or land costs.	25 percent of hard costs full-time-equivalent, year-long, averaging \$35,000	5 percent tax on materials costing 25 percent of hard costs 5.95 percent tax on 81 percent of payroll (Mass. Dept. Revenue, Statistics of Income) 5 percent sales tax on the 22.9 percent of worker income spent on taxable items	(U.S. Dept. of Labor, B.L.S., Boston Metro Consumer Expenditure Survey) Mass. corporate tax revenues average 1.13 percent of earned income annually	Full time and part time jobs, including direct construction jobs. Includes construction workers and those supported by their	wages, and by construction firm suppliers. (Average earnings \$29,843)	50% of "Soft Costs" are assumed to be locally produced business and professional services, creating both direct and indirect jobs, earnings, and taxes.	cannings average \$31,497 per Job.	Taxes calculated as above, all Economic Multipliers are from the	The employment multiplier has been adjusted from \$1080 to \$1001	using the U.S.G.D.P. deflator 1989-1994 (0.8618)	One time, over the construction period.	
1,646 \$115,220,000 \$164,600,000	<b>xes:</b> \$28,805,000 823	\$1,440,250 \$1,388,257 \$329,817	\$325,497 \$3,483,821	"Hard Costs": 2,681 \$80,008,768		696 \$21,914,844		\$4,912,208 \$1 167 025	\$1,151,737	\$1,440,250	\$8,671,221	ent
Number of New Hotel Rooms to be Construct Hard Construction Cost @ \$70,000/Room: Total Development Cost @ \$100,000/Room:	Construction Employment, Earnings, and Ta Construction jobs & wages Payroll (\$000s): Jobs	Massachusetts State Taxes: Construction materials Construction Worker payroll Worker spending sales tax	Corporate Tax Total Direct State Taxes from "Hard Costs"	Indirect Employment, Earnings, and Taxes from Total Impact employment Total Impact earnings	Related to "Soft Cost" Business Services:	Total Impact employment Total Impact earnings	Total Economic Impact:	Income tax sales tax	corporate tax	plus Construction materials sales tax	Total Direct and Indirect StatesTaxes	Source: Boston Redevelopment Authority Research Departme

The Economic and Fiscal Impacts of Construction of 1,646 New Hotel Rooms

## MEGCONH3.XLS

ct 3,259 \$228,130,000 \$325,900,000 Exclusive of site value or land costs.	Taxes:       \$57,032,500       25 percent of hard costs         1,630       full-time-equivalent, year-long, averaging \$35,000	<ul> <li>\$2,851,625</li> <li>5 percent tax on materials costing 25 percent of hard costs</li> <li>\$2,748,681</li> <li>5.95 percent tax on 81 percent of payroll (Mass. Dept. Revenue, Statistics of I</li> <li>\$653,022</li> <li>5 percent sales tax on the 22.9 percent of worker income spent on taxable iter</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>\$644,467</li> <li>\$6,897,796</li> <li>Wass. corporate tax revenues average 1.13 percent of earned income annuall</li> </ul>	om "Hard Costs": 5,308 Full time and part time jobs, including direct construction jobs. \$158,413,472 Includes construction workers and those supported by their wages, and by construction firm suppliers. (Average earnings \$29,843)	1,378 50% of "Soft Costs" are assumed to be locally produced business and profess \$43,390,326 services, creating both direct and indirect jobs, earnings, and taxes. Earnings average \$31,497 per job.	<ul> <li>\$9,725,934 Taxes calculated as above, all Economic Multipliers are from the</li> <li>\$2,310,653 U.S. Dept. Commerce "RIMS II" Handbook, second edition.</li> <li>\$2,280,383 The employment multiplier has been adjusted from \$1989 to \$1994 using the U.S.G.D.P. deflator 1989-1994 (0.8618)</li> <li>\$2,851,625</li> </ul>	\$17,168,595 One time, over the construction period.
vurnuer of New Hotel Kooms to be Construc Hard Construction Cost @ \$70,000/Room: Fotal Development Cost @ \$100,000/Room:	Construction Employment, Earnings, and Construction jobs & wages Payroll (\$000s): Jobs	Massachusetts State Taxes: Construction materials Construction Worker payroll Worker spending sales tax	Corporate Tax otal Direct State Taxes from "Hard Costs"	ndirect Employment, Earnings, and Taxes fro Total Impact employment Total Impact earnings	Total Impact employment Total Impact employment Total Impact earnings	Income tax sales tax corporate tax plus Construction materials sales tax	otai Direct and Indirect StatesTaxes

The Economic and Fiscai impacts of Construction of 3,259 New Hotei Rooms

Source: Boston Redevelopment Authority Research Department

## MEGCONH2.XLS



### Appendix 3

## Development Cost Comparison of the C Street and Northern Avenue Sites

There is a substantial difference in the total development cost of an exposition center constructed on C Street and one constructed on Northern Avenue. In both cases, costs are based on the construction of a facility with a total of 1.44 million square feet containing exhibition space of 550,000 square feet. For an exposition facility of this size, the total development cost at C Street is \$437.9 million; the total development cost at Northern Avenue is \$555.6 million. The difference is \$117.7 million. (See Tables 1 and 2.)

#### **Infrastructure Costs**

A large part of the cost difference, over \$77 million, is attributable to the need to provide new infrastructure as well as to relocate existing infrastructure at the Northern Avenue site. For example, about \$75 million has been allocated for the extension of the South Boston Transitway from the World Trade Center to the end of Northern Avenue. While this extension is not absolutely esstential, it would greatly improve transit access to the new exposition center as well as to the Boston Marine Industrial Park and the area in general. Moreover, the extension could include a underground turnaround at the terminus to accommodate a future upgrade of the bus transitway to light rail. Even if the Transitway were not extended, it would nonetheless have to be partially relocated at a substantial cost if the Northern Avenue site was developed for the exposition center. In general, the infrastructure issues involved at Northern Avenue are more complex than at C Street because both the Haul Road and the Third Third Harbor Tunnel cut through the former. The adjacency to the tunnel may present many complications and hidden costs.

#### Foundation and Hard Costs

There are significant foundation costs at both sites. While the soil condition is poor throughout the Fort Point Channel District, there is substantial geological difference between the sites that requires different strategies for the foundation, causing an impact on the overall cost of construction.



At C Street, the vertical distance from the surface to structurally sound geological material is approximately 40 feet. Excavation to this level would eliminate the need for piles and also provide underground parking beneath the entire footprint of the facility. The main cost will be in the treatment and removal of all the excavated fill and clay material and the construction of perimeter walls. The result of this excavation is a foundation for the building and underground parking for 3,000 spaces, at a cost of \$43 million.

The depth of fill and clay at Northern Avenue, which is much greater than at C Street, will require 150 foot deep piles to anchor the foundation to bedrock. The smaller building footprint and the presence of the Third Harbor Tunnel limits excavation, thus accommodating only 1,918 spaces underground. An additional 1,082 spaces would have to be provided in a separate, on-site garage south of the Haul Road.

The cost of excavation at C Street is nearly the same as the cost of the piles at Northern Avenue, thus balancing out. However, the cost of the additional parking garage to provide the balance of the necessary 3,000 spaces at Northern Avenue will add an additional \$21 million to overall construction cost.

#### Economic and Fiscal Impacts, and Opportunity Costs

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the actual additional cost to develop the project, but does not tabulate the negative economic and fiscal impacts in the event the current uses on the two sites have to be displaced. C Street generates more in property taxes because of the high percentage of privately-owned parcels, but has very little other impact on city revenue. Even though Northern Avenue generates only about 45% as much in property tax, it includes major cityowned buildings within the Boston Marine Industrial Park that generate substantial income.

Although relocation costs represent a small monetary cost of the entire project, the hardship experienced by affected businesses and the potential loss of jobs must also be considered. While 14 businesses with approximately 284 employees would be relocated from C Street, the Northern Avenue site would involve the displacement of 39 businesses with approximately 852 employees.



# SUMMARY OF PROJECT COSTS FOR C STREET TABLE 1

(1994 Dollars)

	Land	Building			
COST I'I EM	Acres	SF	Employees	Percent	COST
Acquistion Cost of Private Property	27.83	275,716			26,443,500
Value of Public Property	1.73	0			540,800
Business Relocation Cost		271,800	284		1,421,800
Infrastructure Relocation					1,000,000
Foundation	-	1,187,300			43,930,100
New Public Infrastructure					1,150,000
Facility Hard Construction Cost		1,440,000			271,809,500
Soft Costs					51,857,900
Contingency				10%	39,815,400
TOTAL PROJECT COST					437,969,000

# SUMMARY OF PROJECT COSTS FOR NORTHERN AVENUE (1994 Dollars) **TABLE 2**

	Land	Building			
COST ITEM	Acres	SF	Employees	Percent	COST
Acquistion Cost of Private Property	5	156,999			6,031,000
Value of Public Property	26	481,799			27,672,500
Business Relocation Cost		531,873	852		2,927,400
Infrastructure Relocation					4,200,000
Foundation		1,015,950			44,701,800
New Public Infrastructure					75,000,000
Facility Hard Construction Cost		1,440,000			280.512.500
Soft Costs					64,053,700
Contingency				10%	50,509,900
TOTAL PROJECT COST					555,608,800



#### **S**0 **S**0 250,000 500,000 20 \$43,930,100 50 **S**0 \$43,930,100 \$850,000 \$300,000 3,000,000 2,000,000 11,258,939 \$1,000,000 30 51,150,000 \$252,000,000 17,809,500 1,000,000 \$1,000,000 2,000,000 \$271,809,500 522,252,272 COST TU COST TO ON TROUT COST TO COST TO PROJECT PROJECT PROJECT PROJECT PROJECT includes support facilities and furnishings Improvements to sidewalk in addition to Summer St rebuild by CA/T project Improvements to "idewalk in addition to Viaduct St rebuild by CA/T project Assumes 50% containinated soil; includes 2 levels for underground parking Rail along Itaul Rd must remain, 22' clearance above 115 KVA line to he relocated from B St and Fargo St COMMENTS 400 SF per space 300 SF per space 40' to bedrock, foundation is deeper than N Ave, but non-pile COMMENTS CONIMIENTS Fargo St and part of B St eliminated Elevated roadway included in building footprint Allowance None required, 1,000 feet to WTC station COMMENTS COMMENTS None required, direct from Haul Road 0 Total Cost Vone taken N/N Vone None Vone Vone 500,000 2,000,000 10.000 250,000 000,000,1 \$3,000,000 Cost/Space None required Allowance **Fixed Fee** Replace (Y / N) V/Nz z 2,968 0 \$11,258,939 1,000,000 \$22,252,272 Number of Soft Cost Allowance Spaces Total \$375.297.962 0 0 0 C 850,000 300,000 \$252,000,000 \$17,809,500 \$317,889,600 \$2,000,000 Relocation **Pile Depth** Total Cost Total Cost Cost Item Amount Cost \$43,930,100 \$2,000,000 **Fixed Cost** Fixed Cost Cost/Unit Cost 7 00% All but acq & relocation Applicable Cost Item BREAKDOWN OF PROJECT COSTS FOR C STREET \$17 00 \$250 00 \$250.00 \$175.00 \$15 00 Cost/SF Cost/LF Square Cost/SF l'ccl 3 00% 1,200 1,440,000 3,400 800 1,187,300 1,187,300 of Cost Lincar Percent l ccl SF Ч SF - World Trade Ctr xposition Center Hard Construction <sup>9</sup>edestrian Access - South Station FACILITY CONSTRUCTION PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE Vehicle Access Improvements stand Alone Parking Structure Inderground Parking Fit-up Site Landscaping, pawing, etc Julier Professional Services xcavation & Foundation VIBIA - Rail Extension Jesign and Fingineering mpact Mitigation Costs roject Administration NFRASTRUCTURE Nater & Sewer 1 ines Public Transport Rail RELOCATION Permitting & EIR ommercial Rail NIN FOUNDATION Water & Sewer SOFT COSTS **TABLE 3** 'ublic Parking Iruck Access Public Roads ower Lines laul Road Sub Total .egal Fees ias Lines Sub Total Sub Total 21E Study Sub Lotal

\$51,857,918

11,596,707

**S**11,596,707

\$386,556,901

3 00% All

inancing Fees

Sub Total



	-			-	A11	-			
INFRASTRUCTURE	Eret	Square	CosvUnit	Kelocation	Allowance	(V / N)		COMMENIS	COST TO
Douter liner	000 0				1 200 000	, ,	115 K VA line to	he relocated from Haul Rd	
						• >			00,002,16
Waler & Sewer Lines					000°000'1	-	JU UIAINCICI SCH		000'000'16
Gas Lines							None		<b>2</b> 0
('ommercial Rail						z	Rail along Haul	d must remain; 22° elearance above	\$0
I laul Road					2.000.000	۶	l erminus moved	to Summer St; no Summer St entry to MIP	<b>\$</b> 2,000.000
Public Roads						z	Trilling Way is c	liminated	<b>S</b> 0
Public Transport Rail							None		\$0
Public Parking							None taken		<b>\$</b> 0
Sub Total					-				\$4,200,000
NOLL	ť	Cost/SF	Cost	Pile Denth			COMME		BPOIECT
	5	10000							נאסזברו
Pides	1,015,950	<b>\$</b> 20.00	<b>5</b> 20.319,000	150		500 lbs per square	e foot loading		<b>5</b> 20.319,000
Excavation & Foundation	1,015,950	\$24 00	\$24.382.800			Assumes 50% con	taminated soil; in	cludes structure for underground parking	<b>\$</b> 24,382,800
Sub Total									\$44,701,800
NEW									COST TO
PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE	1 H	CasULF	Fired Cost	Total Cost			COMME	NTS	PROJECT
NIBIA - Rail Extension	1,750			75,000,000		Extend transitway	add new station.	New turnaround required. MPA estimate	\$75,000,000
Vehicle Access Improvements				0		None required			<b>\$</b> 0
Pedestrian Access - Sidwalks	0		0	0		Extension of trans.	itway eliminates (	vdestrian requirement	\$0
- Bridges				0		None required			<b>S</b> 0
Truck Access				0		None required			\$0
Water & Sewer				0		None required			<b>\$</b> 0
Sub Total									\$75,000.000
					Number of				COST TO
FACILITY CONSTRUCTION	SF	Cost/SF	Fixed Cost	Total Cost	Spaces	Cost/Space	Total Cost	COMMENTS	PROJECT
	1 110 000	00 3613		C157 000 000					
t sposition t enter llard t onstruction Grand Alone Parking Structure	100,000	00 053			000	15 000	1 \$ 000 000	includes support ractifies and furthsmings 300 SE ner chare	000.000.222&
I inderivenund Parking 1 iin	767 500	S15 00		511.512.500	6161	V/N	V/N	400 SF ner snare	11 512 500
Site Landscaping, paving, etc			\$2.000.000	\$2,000,000				Allowance	2,000,000
Sub Total									\$280,512,500
	Percent			Cost Item	I otal	l'ixed l ec			COS1 10
SOFT COSTS	of Cost	Applicable	Cost Item	Amount	Soft Cost	Allowance		COMMENTS	PROJECT
Design and Engineering	2 00° 5	All but acq. &	relocation	\$404,414,300	\$28,309,001				\$28,309,001
l egal Fees						\$1,000.000			3.000.000
21F Study						250,000			250.000
Permitting & EIR						500.000			500.000
Impact Mitigation Costs						2,000.000			2,000,000
Other Professional Services						000'000'1\$			1,000,000
Project Administration	3 000 8	All		476,104.205	14,283,126				14 283.126
l inancing f ces	9 00 E	IIV		166,387,990	514,711,620				14.711.620
Sub Total									564,053,747

**IABLE 4** BREAKDOWN OF PROJECT COSTS FOR NORTHERN AVENUE



# TABLE 5 COST TO ACQUIRE SITE AND RELOCATE BUSINESSES

	C STREET		NORTHERN AVE	NUE
Property Acquisition	Square Feet	COST	Square Feet	COST
Private Property Acquisition	1,212,358	\$26,443,540	216,775	6,030,970
State Property Opportunity Cost	27,490	540,800	662,146	12,812,366
City Property Acquisition	0	0	301,514	10,465,659
Federal Property Acquisition	0	0	136,587	4,394,500
Sub Total	1,239,848	26,984,340	1,317,022	33,703,495
Business Relocation	271,800	1,421,750	531,873	2,927,410
Total Site Acquisition and Relocation Cost		\$28,406,090		\$36,630,904

# TABLE 6 BUSINESS IMPACT COMPARISON

.

	C STR	EET		N	<b>DRTHERN AVENU</b>	JE
	Maritime	Non-maritime	Total	Maritime	Non-maritime	Total
DISPLACED JOBS	149	135	284	280	572	852
NUMBER OF RELOCATED BUSINESSES	5	6	14	13	26	. 39
BUILDING SQUARE FEET TO RELOCATE	96,180	179,536	275,716	162,326	476,472	638,798
VALUE OF BUILDINGS DEMOLISHED	\$374,000	\$2,624,000	\$2,998,000	\$3,758,070	\$8,410,820	\$12,168,890



### Appendix 4

#### Cost Benefit Analysis

This section presents the results of the market and economic analysis, and development cost estimates detailed in the previous three appendices in the form of a pro-forma for the construction period and the first 25 years of operation of the facility after completion.

The first four tables summarize the total annual attendance and spending (Table 1); the total annual economic impact (Table 2); the annual total fiscal benefits (Table 3); and annual operating costs (Table 4) for a new exposition center with 550,000 gross square feet of exhibition space independent of a specific site. The final two tables describe the economic performance of the site specific facilities, comparing the annual net fiscal impacts of a generic exposition center (Table 3) to the net operating deficit, including debt service, for the facility at C-Street (Table 5) and Northern Avenue (Table 6) based on the different development costs of the two sites.

While it is clear that the construction of a new exposition center will bring substantial economic benefit to the Commonwealth over the long term, the total development cost has an impact on the economic performance of the facility through the first 25 years of operation.

As a result of the development cost difference betwen the two sites being considered, a facility at C Street is expected to break even in the year 2009, three years earlier than the same facility sited at Northern Avenue

,

TABLE I <u>ANNUAL ATTENDANCE AND SPENDING (\$000's)</u>

1996-2010	Assumptions	9661	1997	8661	6661	2000	1002	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Cunvention and Irade Shuw Attendees														_		
Overnight Visitors	ے()ی <b>ہ</b> •	c	c	C	C	011/110	141,219	(151,00)	162 201	174 412	186,809	808'001	911,736	228,360	241,813	20.0,136
Regional Attendees	۹ راي ۹	0	C	0	0	56.292	60,523	65,001	69,741	74,756	80,061	85.671	109,16	97,869	104,491	111,487
Total Attendees (exel consumer shows)		U	С	0	U	187.641	201,742	216.670	212.470	249,188	266,870	285,569	305,337	326,229	348,304	371,623
Spending by Attendeet	\$ Visitor 5. Rgul													-		
וויזכן 1 מוענומע	00.05 55.1713	0\$	υŚ	ç	\$U	\$58.271	\$4.5,785	\$74,185	\$81,574	\$94,064	\$105,775	\$118,846	\$133,427	\$149,684	\$167,803	\$187,990
Thitel Restaurant	\$80.11 \$10.07	0	c	0	c	15,262	17.210	19,410	21,880	24 646	27,704	121 15	14.946	10,201	41,949	11201
Differ Restantant	\$8105 \$11 St	c	c	C	c	15810	17,855	20135	22,6.84	115 22	28,710	12.257	10.215	40,627	45,545	51,024
Hespitality Suries	\$ 17 88 \$18 OF	C	c	c	c	1214	8 1:14	9,181	10, 346	11 645	13,005	14.713	16,518	18,531	20,77.4	12212
I utedanine of	\$ 16.11 \$18.22	c	=	c	=	6.018	218.7	8,812	050.0	otal 11	12 504	14,150	15 886	17,8,21	646 61	281 22
Retail	\$59.71 \$29.87	0	c	=	C	11,377	12,844	14,484	11: 117	18, 36,5	20,652	1.20.1	20.050	10.234	12.76.2	16,701
l ocal Transportation	511 31 S15 67	υ	С	C	C	5,967	6.736	7,596	8.557	1£9'6	10,8,11	12.169	13,662	15.326	17,182	19,249
Other	12 81 814 21	C	C	0	0	5.411	6,108	6,888	7,760	8,734	9,821	11,035	12,388	13,898	15,580	17,455
I otal Spending by Attendees		C	υ	c	0	126,260	142,530	160,730	181,080	203,810	229,180	257,500	289,090	324.320	363,570	407,310

## **LABLE 1 (Continue)**

011-2025	Assumptions		2011	2012	102	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	
innvention and Trade Show Attendees																		
A criticality A reitors	7(10 %	50	911.05	560,136	260,136	260,136	260,136	260.136	260.136	260,136	260.136	260,136	260,136	260,136	260,136	260,136	260,136	
tegional Attendees	11 <sup>n</sup> 6	=	11.487	111,487	111,487	111.487	111,487	111.487	111.487	111.487	111.487	111,487	111.487	111.487	111.487	111.487	111,487	
tatal Attendees (excl. consumer shows)		1	1.623	171-623	171,623	120,171	171,623	171,621	171.621	171,623	171,621	171,623	171.621	121,621	171,623	171,623	171,623	
inending by Attendees	\$ Visitor \$	Rgnl																
lotel Lodeme	\$ 35 1213	1 00 01	0.81,70	052,702	217 622	105 822	820'012	251 924	264,520	277 712	201,614	106 216	121,526	117,601	184 481	172.207	190,817	
Intel Restaurant	\$ 11.085	10.07	81 608	18212	\$6.007	\$0,847	62,840	65,982	182,06	72.745	76.382	80,201	81,211	88 422	118,20	07,485	051-201	
Wher Restaurant	\$81.05 \$	\$ 1511	025.15	\$6.254	59 067	62 020	65,121	68,178	962.17	75, 184	79,156	81,113	87,269	91,632	46,214	101,025	106,076	
lospitality Suites	\$17.88 \$1	18 94	24,436	25658	110.92	28.288	101,02	31,188	12,747	1.4 18.4	16,104	37,909	39,80.1	41,795	43,884	46.078	48, 382	
ntertanment	15 11.415	18 22	105.13	24 676	25,910	27 205	28,566	50'007	11,494	11,068	14,722	36.458	18.281	40,195	42,204	44,315	46,530	
terail	250 74 53	10.87	18.518	40 465	42,488	119 88	46,844	49,186	51.645	54.227	56,939	59.786	62.775	65,914	69,209	72.670	76,303	
ocal Transportation	15 11 115	15 6.7	112.05	222 12	182 22	201'12	24,567	25,795	27,085	28.410	29,861	31.354	12,922	34,568	16,296	38,111	40.016	
After	528.41 \$1	1 21	18, 127	19,244	20,206	21.216	22.277	23,391	24,560	25,788	27.078	28,432	29,853	31,346	32,913	34,559	36,287	
Lotal Spending by Attendees		4.2	27,680	140,060	471,510	495,090	519,840	545,840	573,130	601,780	611,870	663,470	696,640	731,470	768,050	806,450	846,770	

S.HON

• Attendance estimates are based upon a conservative period of ten vears from opening required to attain stabilized occupancy

Average duration of visitor stavits 3.2 nights

• Regional attendees spend nothing on hotel rooms and  $St^{\mu}$ , as much as visitors on all other categories

- Inflation is assumed to be  $\mathbb{P}^n$  , through the velo 2000 and  $S^n$  , thereafter

	-
	10
	-
1	0
	-
	69
	$\sim$
6	
	- E .
	()
1	-
-	-
	~
	2
2	5
	<b>.</b>
	-
	()
	-
	~
	e
5	-
	1
	$\Box$
E	
6	()
6	
	_ E
1	٦
E.	-
En	-
1	-
1	
3	7
	-
	7
II.	-
-	<
	-

1996-2010	Assumptions	9661	1997	8661	6661	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Off Site Impact																
Number of Johs Created		C	0	Û	0	3,049	3,348	3,647	3.946	4,245	4,544	4,843	5,142	5,441	5,740	6:039
New Earnings	\$19,883 / job	0	0	0	0	72,385	83,457	95,456	108,446	122,497	137,681	154,078	171,770	190,846	211,400	233,532
Total Output	1 9631 multiplier	0	0	0	0	231,110	260,890	294,204	331,454	373,060	419,497	471,335	529,158	593,645	665,488	745,551
On Site Impact																
Number of Johs Created		2,215	2.215	2,215	2,215	478	484	490	496	502	508.	513	519	525	531	537
New Farmings - Direct On Site	\$20,197 / job	C	c	C	C	5,950	7,012	7,362	7.730	8,117	8,523	8,949	966'6	9,866	10,359	10,877
New 1 annugs - Induect	520, 189 / job	0	0	C	C	6,778	6.620	020,7	1.57.4	8,110	8,691	0.120	100'01	10,740	11,543	12,414
New Farmings - Facility Construction	528.817 / job	63,816	65,730	67,702	111,93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fotal New Farmings		63,816	65,730	67.702	181,931	12,728	13,632	14,441	15,304	16.227	17,213	18,268	19,397	20,606	21,902	23,292
I oral Output	1 9709 inultiplier	200,116	206,146	212,517	218,913	38,090	40,373	42,811	45,421	48,212	51,200	54,401	57,813	61,515	65,467	69,712
Intel Construction Impact																
Number of New Rooms Developed		412	412	412	412	161	161	161	161	161	161	161	161	161	161	0
Number of Johs Created		845	845	845	845	330	330	330	330	330	330	330	016	330	330	0
New Farnings	5,12,022 / job	27,066	27,878	28,714	29,575	11,911	12,507	13,132	13.789	14.478	15,202	15,962	16,761	17,599	18,479	0
I otal Output	See note helow	67,024	69,022	71,080	661'12	29,498	30,964	32,504	34.120	35,818	37,600	39,472	41,437	43,500	45,666	0

## TABLE 2 (Continue)

.

6,576 256,824 815,263

6.602 251,781 776.621

6.207 229.051 698,659

5,992 207,927 628,428

5.687 188,308 565,208

5,382 170,097 508,298

5.077 153.202 457.090

4.772 137,540 410,996

4.467 123,029 369,520

4,162 109,596 332,227

3,060 99,309 292,112

1,060 93,608

1,060 90,882

I atal b commic Impact

Fotal New Earnings

Lotal Output

I otal Johs Created

1.857 97,024 298.697

3.000 96,416 283,616

275,369

267,361

111-2025	Assumptions	2011	2012	1102	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
M Sta Image																
Jumber of Jobs Crealed		6.019	610.9	6.039	6:039	6.039	6,039	6.039	610.9	6.039	6.039	6:039	6.019	6:039	6:039	6,039
Jew I annugs	401/ 011, 148	245.200	257,460	270,341	283,860	298,051	312,956	328,601	145.014	31,2.285	380,400	399,420	419,301	440,360	462.378	485,497
total Output	1 96.11 multiplici	742,414	210,128	Het 1, 116+4	122,000	625 156	000,121	1,049,073	1,101,514	205'951'1	1.214.444	1,275,149	1.118,2011	1,405,860	1,476,149	150'055'1
In Site Impact															-	
Jumber of Jobs Created		537	517	517	537	537	537	537	517	512	537	537	537	537	537	537
Vew Farnings - Direct On Site	\$20,197 / Jab	11.421	11,992	12,592	13.221	13,882	14,577	15,305	16.071	16.874	17,718	18.604	19,534	20.511	21,536	22.613
Vew Earnings - Indirect	\$20, 189 / job	51011	11,6.87	14.171	060'51	15,844	16,636	17,468	18,342	10,259	20,222	21,233	22.294	23,409	24,580	25,809
Vew Fainings - Facility Construction	50 / job	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total New Farnings		24,456	25,679	26,963	28,311	29,727	31,213	32,774	34,412	36,133	37,940	39,837	41,828	43,920	46,116	48,422
otal Output	1 9709 multiplier	191.17	76,857	80,700	84,735	88,972	93,420	160'86	102,996	108,146	113,553	119.211	125,192	131,452	138,024	144,926
latel Construction Impact			-											- 12		
Vumber of New Rooms Developed		C	С	C	0	С	0	0	0	C	0	0	C	С	C	0
Jumher of Jobs Created		C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C	0	0	
Jew Farnings	401/ 220.218	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
otal Output	See note helow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C	υ	0	0	0	0
total Economic Impact																
Total Jobs Created		6 576	6.576	6.576	6.576	6.576	6,576	6,576	6.576	6.576	6,576	6,576	6.576	6,576	6.576	6,576
total New Earnings		269,665	283,148	297,306	312,171	327,780	344,169	361,377	379,446	398,418	418,339	439,256	461.219	484,280	508,494	533,919

### STION

Lotal Output

• Onsite economic impact includes direct spending to operate the facility spending by suppliers of goods and services, and construction impact

1.694,877

1,614,173

1,537,312

1,464,095

1,194,180

1, 127, 987

1 264,738

1.204.510

1,147,165

1,092.542

1.040 501

990,962

111,764

898.820

850,015

• Hotel construction assumes development of the additional 3.258 rooms in the metropolitan area which will be required to service the visitors

• Multipliers for output during facility and hotel construction periods are 2.1753 for hard costs and 2.1181 for applicable soft costs

![](_page_71_Picture_0.jpeg)
	-
	1
	-
	-
	-
	$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}$
	-
	÷
	1.4
	-
	1 - 1
	-
	7
	~
	1 1
	1.1
	$\sim$
	_
	-
	-
	-
	-
	20
	- <u>1</u>
-	
- A .	-
	-
	-
-	-
3	7
-	-
-	7
~	-
	-

# (s, 0)

1996-2010	Assumptions	9661	1 66 1	8661	6661	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Direct Off Site Taxes from Spending	Far Rate										-		-			
Room Occupance Lax Citys & Towns	4 00%	0	0	C	0	2,619	2,957	3,335	3,757	4,228	4,755	5,342	5,998	6,729	7,543	8,451
Room Occupancy Tax State	5 70°6	0	C	0	0	3,733	4,214	4,752	5.353	6.025	6,776	7.613	8,547	9,588	10,749	12,042
Alcals Tax	\$ 00%	U	c	C	C	1,554	1,754	1,978	2,229	2,508	2,821	3,169	3,558	3,992	4,475	5,013
Sales Inc	۲ ۱۳۳۰		-	=	Ξ	605	642	724	816	918	1.00.1	1,160	1,303	1461	1.638	1,815
Total Direct OII Site Tax Revenue		1)	4	=	2	8.475	9,56.8	10,789	12,155	13,680	15, 18.4	17,285	19,405	21,770	24-405	27, 141
Indirect Off Site Taxes	lay Rate Phied in															
Intome Lax	\$ 95° 81 00°	u	C	=	C	1.480	4 022	4,601	5.227	106'5	6,616	7.426	8 278	9,198	10,188	11,255
( nipertate law	9 00° • 12 46°	0	G	a	c	818	643	1.079	1 226	1,385	1,556	1,742	1,942	2,157	2,390	2,640
Sales Tax	\$ 00°6 22 90° 0	0	0	0	0	829	956	1,093	1.242	1,403	1.576	1.764	1,967	2,185	2,421	2.674
Total Indirect Off Site Tax Revenue		0	υ	U	U	5,136	5,921	6.773	7,694	8,691	9,768	10,932	12,187	13,540	14,999	16,569
On Site Taxes - Direct & Indirect																
Income Tax		1 261	1,161	1,462	1 565	556	\$80	625	661	104	747	794	844	808	956	1,018
Corporate Tax		792	788	812	816	11	75	80	86	62	86	105	113	121	130	140
Sales Tax		775	798	822	847	132	140	148	158	167	178	189	201	213	227	242
Total On Site Taxes		4,830	4,947	\$,096	5,249	765	804	853	906	963	1.023	1.088	1,158	1,231	1,313	1,400
Hotel Construction Perind Taxes																
Income Lav		101'1	1,342	1 382	1 423	\$73	602	632	664	697	212	768	807	847	889	0
Corporate fax		306	315	124	334	135	141	148	156	164	172	180	180	661	209	0
Sales Tax		269	113	735	757	305	320	336	353	370	389	408	429	450	473	0
Total Hotel Construction Taxes		2,301	2,370	2.441	2,514	1.013	1,063	1,116	1,172	1.231	1.292	1,357	1.425	1,496	1.571	0
TO FAL FISCAL IMPACT		011'1	7.317	7,536	7.763	15.388	17,356	19.532	21,927	24,565	27,468	30.661	34,175	38,039	42,287	45,309

# **FABLE 3 (Continue)**

2011-2025	Assumptions	1102	2012	2013	2014	2014	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	1,202	2024	2025
Direct Off Site Taxes from Spending	I at Rate															
Room Occupance Law Citys & Towns	4 ()(), <sup>u</sup>	8 871	0 117	1 82 0	10 272	10 785	11,324	11,891	12,485	011-11	13,765	14.451	15,176	516'51	16,731	17 568
Ream Occupance Las State	\$ 7(1° 6	12.644	11 276	01-0-11	14 617	091-51	16 117	16.044	107.71	18,481	19,615	20.506	21,626	22 707	23,842	25 034
Meals Iax	\$ 00° 5	\$ 264	128 8	1 () 8 5	160.9	6,398	6,718	7,054	7.407	111,1	8,166	8.574	6,003	9,453	9,925	10,422
Vales lat	د ()(ای 9	1,927	2,023	2,124	2,231	2,342	2.459	2,582	2.711	2,847	2,989	3,139	3,296	3.460	3,633	3,815
Total Direct Off Site Lax Revenue		28,708	30,143	31,650	31,233	34,894	36,639	38,471	40,195	42,414	44,535	46,762	49,100	51,555	54,133	56,839
Indirect Off Site Taxes	Eas Rale pplied to															
Inconse Law	4 94° 8 RI (11° ,	11 818	12 409	13 029	13,681	14,365	15,081	15,837	16,629	17,460	18,331	19 250	20,213	21,223	22,284	23,399
ווודאיוומוכ למי	9 ()(1° 。 12 56° 。	2 7 7 2	2 910	950-1	3,209	1 169	3,538	\$12'8	1 900	4.095	4,300	4,515	4,741	4,978	٢,227	\$ 488
vales lax	5 (10°6 22 9(1° a	2,808	2 948	1,095	3,250	3.413	3,583	3,761	3.951	4,148	4.356	4,573	4,802	5,042	5.294	\$,559
Total Indirect OIT Site Tax Revenue		17,397	18,267	19 181	20,140	21,147	22,204	23,314	24,480	25,704	26,989	28,338	29,755	31,241	32,805	14,446
On Site Taxes - Direct & Indirect																
Income Lav		1 069	1 122	1 1 78	1,237	1 299	1,364	1,432	1 504	1.579	1,658	1,741	1.828	6161	2 015	2 116
Corporate Tax		147	155	162	171	179	188	197	207	218	229	240	252	265	278	292
Sales lax		254	267	280	294	309	324	340	357	375	394	414	434	416	479	503
Total On Site Taxes		1,470	1,541	1 620	102'1	1,786	1.876	1.970	2,068	2,171	2,280	2.194	2,514	2,610	2.771	2,910
Untel Construction Perind Tares																
tereme lav		¢	с	c	C	c	U	C	c	c	C	c	C	c	С	c
terperate Law		¢	÷	0	e	с	c	¢	÷	e	¢	c	c	0	c	c
hales las		0	C	=	C	0	0	0	=	c	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lotal Hotel Construction Laves		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	c	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL HSCAL IMPACT		47,575	49 954	52 451	\$5,074	\$7,827	60,719	63,755	66,942	70,290	73,804	77.494	81,369	85,417	89,709	301.40

NOILI S
All fixeal henefits are based on existing tax structure and assume no new taxes
All fixeal henefits are based on existing tax structure and assume no new taxes
Rivim Occupancy Laxes for Cities and Towns is earned by all nietropolitan area municipalities which provide hotel rooms
Rivim Occupancy Laxes for Cities and Towns is earned by all nietropolitan area municipalities which provide hotel rooms
Rivim Occupancy Laxes for Cities and Towns is earned by all nietropolitan area municipalities which provide hotel rooms
Rivim Occupancy Laxes for Cities and Towns is earned by all nietropolitan area

.

	~
	-
	Ξ
	Ξ
	6
	~
	S.
	_
	J.
	. <b>~</b>
	-
	- U
	7
	-
	-
	~
	122
	-
	-
	0
	Ξ,
5	-
	-
	-
	-
~	7
	1.7
<	6
	-

¥

1996-2010	Assumptions	9661	1001	1998	6661	2000	2001	2002	2001	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<u>()ccupancy</u>		<	c	c	c	46.450	160 06	91915	\$7 547	41 686	190.95	70,697	75 585	80.757	166.28	10010
Occupied Sq. FT Days Concentions		> (				001-04	001.20	000.00	007.96	36.400		70.00	001.75	000 20	C77'00	PCC 16
Consumer Shows	15 0% occupanc	0	D	5	P	20,400	20,400	70.400	20,400	70,400	20.400	20,400	20,400	20,400	20.400	26,400
Total Occupied Sq. Ft. Days (OSFD)		0	0	0	0	72,850	76,341	80,036	83,947	88,086	92,463	97,092	101,985	107,157	112,623	118,394
Occupancy Rate	320 days/yr	() <sup>6</sup> °	00 %	00 %	0%	41%	43%	45%	48%	50%	53%	55%	58%	61%	64%	67%
Operating Income	5 5661															
Rent Conventions/Shows	50 045 /OSLD	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,955	\$4,352	\$4,790	\$5.276	\$5,813	\$6,406	\$7,064	\$7,790	\$8,595	\$9,485	\$10,469
Event Services	\$0 039 /OSFD	0	0	0	0	3,392	3,732	4,108	4,524	4,985	5,494	6,057	6,681	176.7	8,134	8,978
F & B Commissions Exposistion	\$0 02) /OSFD	0	0	0	0	2.024	2,227	2.451	2,700	2,975	3,279	3,615	3,987	4,398	4,854	5,358
Parking	CI ISO/: 900-0\$	0	0	0	0	528	581	639	704	776	855	146	1.040	1,147	1,266	1,307
Rent from Support Space	\$7.00 100,000	C	c	0	C	836	857	878	006	120	946	696	904	1,018	1,044	1,070
Other	5 0°°	0	0	0	0	495	545	599	660	727	802	884	975	1.076	1,187	1,310
fotal ()perating Revenue		0	0	0	0	11.229	12,292	13,467	14,764	16,197	17,781	19,532	21,466	23,605	25,969	28,583
Operating Expenses - Fixed	\$23.61 /SF	0	0	0	0	(15,505)	(16,281)	(17.095)	(17,949)	(18,847)	(19,789)	(20.779)	(21,818)	(22,909)	(24.054)	(25,257)
- Variable	514 05 /SF	0	0	0	0	(3.821)	(4.204)	(4.628)	(5,096)	(5,615)	(6.189)	(6.824)	(7.526)	(8,303)	(6,163)	(10,114)
Net Operating Income (1 058)		С	0	C	С	(8,097)	(8,192)	(8.256)	(8,282)	(8,265)	(8,197)	(8.071)	(7,8,77)	(7,607)	(7,247)	(6,788)

# TABLE 4 (Continue)

•

2011-2025	Assumptions	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Оссиряпсу																
Occupied Sq. It Days Conventions	550,000 Sq Ft	91,994	61'64	66,16	66°16	91,994	91,994	91,994	91,994	91,994	91,994	91,994	91 <sup>,</sup> 994	91,994	91 <sup>,</sup> 994	91,994
Consumer Shows	15 0% occupanc	26,400	26.400	26,400	26,400	26,400	26,400	26.400	26,400	26,400	26.400	26,400	26,400	26,400	26,400	26,400
Total Occupied Sq Ft Days (OSFD)		118,394	118,394	118,394	118,394	118,394	118,394	118,394	118,394	118,394	118,394	118,394	118,394	118,394	118,394	118,394
()ccupancy Rate	320 days/yr	6.7%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%	67%
Operating Income	1094 \$											-				
Rent Conventions/Shows	50.045 /OSFD	10,993	11.543	12,120	12.726	13,362	14,030	14,732	15,468	16,242	17,054	17,906	18,802	19,742	20,729	21.765
Frent Services	0 039 /OSFD	6,427	9,808,0	10,393	10,913	11,459	12,032	12,633	13.265	13,928	14,625	15,356	16,124	16,930	17,776	18,665
F & B Commissions Expression	\$0.023 //OSFD	5.626	5,907	6,202	6,512	6,838	7,180	7,539	7,916	8,312	8,727	9,164	9,622	10.103	10,608	11,138
Parking	\$0.006 OSLD	1.467	1,540	1,617	1,698	1,783	1,872	1.966	2,064	2,167	2,276	2,390	2.509	2.615	2,766	2,905
Rent from Support Space	\$7.00 100,000	1.007	1.124	1,152	1, 81,	1.211	1,241	1.272	1,304	1, 136	1,370	1.404	015.1	1.475	1,512	1,550
Other	ک (ای ؟	1,176	1.411	1.517	1.592	1,672	1.756	1.841	916-1	2,012	2,134	2.241	2,151	2.470	2.594	2.724
Total Operating Revenue		20,085	11.457	11,002	14.621	16, 124	98,110	310,085	11,952	44,017	46,185	48,46-0	SO, RIR	151.15	580'55	58,747
Operating Lypenses - Lixed	523.61 /SF	(26,520)	(27,846)	(20,238)	(30.700)	(32.235)	(33.846)	(35,539)	(11.116)	(19,182)	(41,141)	(43.198)	(45.357)	(47,625)	(50,007)	(52,507)
- Variable	\$14.05 /SF	(10.619)	(11,150)	(11.708)	(12,293)	(12.908)	(13,553)	(14,231)	(14.943)	(15.690)	(16,474)	(17,298)	(18,163)	(120,01)	(20,025)	(21.026)
Net Operating Income (Loss)		(7,154)	(ot 5'2)	(7,944)	(8,370)	(8.818)	(9,289)	(9,785)	(901'01)	(10,854)	(11,430)	(12,036)	(12.671)	(13,342)	(14,046)	(14,786)

.

# NOLES

• Consumer Shows provide additional operating revenue, but do not affect incremental spending and fiscal benefits

• Allowing sufficient time for change over, 60% is generally consulered to be maximum occupancy

• Operating revenues and expenses are based upon the February, 1903 Feasibility. Analysis performed by Coopers & Lybrand

· Rent from Support Space represents net income from a 100,000 S1 portion of the facility leased for restaurants, shops, and entertainment

The break down of fixed vs. variable operating expenses is based upon DRA estimates.

\*

# TABLE 5 ANNUAL ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE FOR C-STREET FACILITY (\$000's)

1996-2010	Assumptions	9661	1997	8661	6661	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Net Operating Income (Loss)	(From Table 4)	0	U	0	0	(8,097)	(8,192)	(8,256)	(8,282)	(8,265)	(8,197)	(8.071)	(7.877)	(7.607)	(7,247)	(6,788)
Financing																
Deht Service (Principal)	\$464.7 million								,							
Terms (Rate, Term)	6 50°6 30	(35,584)	(35,584)	(15,584)	(15,584)	(35,584)	(35,584)	(35,584)	(15,584)	(35,584)	(35,584)	(35,584)	(35,584)	(15,584)	(35,584)	(15,584)
Interest Income	5 50°6 /y car	23,001	15,334	10,223	5,111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NET INCOME (LOSS)		(\$12,582)	(\$20,249)	(\$25,361)	(\$10,472)	(\$43,681)	(\$43,776)	(\$43,839)	(\$43,865)	(\$43,848)	(\$43,780)	(\$43,654)	(\$43,461)	(\$43,190)	(\$42,831)	(\$42,371)

OTAL FISCAL INPACT	(I rom Table 3)	<b>5</b> 7,130	211.72	<b>\$7,536</b>	<b>\$</b> 7,763	<b>5</b> 15,388	<b>\$</b> 17,356	\$19,532	\$21,927	\$24,565	\$27,468	<b>5</b> 30,661	<b>5</b> 34,175	\$38°039	\$42,287	<b>\$</b> 45,309
VET INCOME (LOSS)		(\$12,582)	(\$20,249)	(\$25,361)	(\$30.472)	(\$43,681)	(\$43,776)	(\$43,839)	(\$43,865)	(\$43.848)	(\$43,780)	(\$43.654)	(\$43,461)	(\$43,190)	(\$42,831)	(\$42,371)
NET FCONOMIC IMPACT		(\$5,452)	(512,932)	(\$17,824)	(\$22,710)	(\$28,291)	(\$26,420)	(\$24,308)	(\$21,918)	(\$19.283)	(\$16,313)	(\$12.993)	(39,286)	(\$5,152)	(\$544)	\$2,918

# TABLE 5 (Continue)

2011-2025	Assumptions	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Net Operating Income (1 055)	tfrom Table 4)	(7,154)	(015.7)	(7.944)	(8,370)	(8,818)	(9,289)	(9.785)	(908,01)	(10,854)	(014.11)	(12,036)	(12,671)	(13,342)	(14,046)	(14,786)
Financing									_							
Debt Service (Principal)	\$464.7 million															
Leuns (Rate, Leun)	6.50°° 10	(15,584)	(15,58.1)	(15,584)	(15,584)	(15,584)	(15,584)	(15,584)	(15,584)	(15,584)	(15,584)	(15,584)	(15,584)	(15,584)	(15,584)	(15,58.1)
Interest Income	5 50°6 /year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NET INCOME (LOSS)		(42,738)	(41,121)	(43,528)	(43.954)	(44,402)	(44.873)	(45,368)	(45,890)	(46.437)	(47,013)	(47,619)	(48.256)	(48.926)	(49,630)	(50,370)

										ł			ł			
FOTAL FISCAL IMPACT	(Fiom Table 3)	47.575	49,954	52 451	55.074	57.827	60,719	63,755	66.942	70.290	73,804	77.494	81,369	85,437	89,709	94,195
NET INCOME (LOSS)		(42,738)	(43,123)	(43.528)	(43,954)	(44,402)	(44.873)	(45.368)	(45,890)	(46.437)	(47,013)	(47,619)	(48.256)	(48,926)	(49,630)	(50.370)
NET ECONOMIC INPACT		4,817	1189	120,8	11.120	13,426	15,846	18,386	21,053	21.852	26,791	29.875	111.11	16,512	40,080	41,825

s HÓN

• Transmuss a Weyrean general obligation boul issued by the Commonwealth at a 6.5% yield. If a revenue boud were issued,

delet vervice payments could be scheduled to better reflect the facility construction and leave up periods. The principal automit of

the debt equals the estimated development cost at the C. Sucet site inflated for two vears

• Interest meane is caused on the unspent portion of development funds and is based upon a negative arbitrage of 1°6



# TABLE 6 ANNUAL ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE FOR NORTHERN AVENUE FACILITY (\$000's)

1996-2010	Assumptions	1996	1997	8661	6661	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Net Operating Income (Loss)	(From Table 4)	0	0	0	0	(8,097)	(8,192)	(8,256)	(8.282)	(8,265)	(8,197)	(8,071)	(7,877)	(7,607)	(7,247)	(6,788)
Inancing															_	
Jebt Service (Principal)	\$589.4 million															
Terms (Rate, Term)	6 50% 30	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)
Interest Income	5 50% /year	29,177	19,451	12,968	6,484	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NET INCOME (LOSS)		(815,960)	(\$25,686)	(\$32,170)	(\$38,654)	(\$53,235)	(\$\$3,330)	(\$\$3,393)	(\$53,419)	(\$53,402)	(\$53,334)	(\$53,208)	(\$10,62\$)	(\$52,744)	(\$\$2,3\$5)	(\$51,925)

															-	
TOTAL LISCAL, IMPACT	(1 tour Inlife 1)	01125	\$7,317	\$7,536	\$7,763	\$15,388	<b>3</b> 17,356	<b>\$</b> 19,532	\$21,927	\$24,565	\$27,468	\$30,661	\$14,175	610'885	\$42,287	\$45,309
VET INCOME (LOSS)		(\$15,960)	(\$25,686)	(532,170)	(\$38,654)	(\$53,235)	(\$\$3,330)	(£6£'£5 <b>\$</b> )	(\$53,419)	(\$53,402)	(\$53,334)	(\$53,208)	(\$13,015)	(\$52,744)	(\$52,385)	(\$51,925)
NET ECONOMIC IMPACT		(\$8,830)	(818,369)	(\$24,633)	(168'0(\$)	(\$37,847)	(\$35,974)	(\$33,862)	(\$31,492)	(\$28,837)	(\$25,867)	(\$22,547)	(\$18,840)	(\$14,706)	(\$10,098)	(\$6,616)

# TABLE 6 (Continue)

2011-2025	Assumptions	1102	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Net Operating Income (Loss)	(From Table 4)	(7,154)	(685'1)	(1,944)	(8,370)	(8,818)	(9,289)	(9,785)	(908'01)	(10,854)	(11,430)	(12,036)	(12,673)	(13,342)	(14,046)	(14,786)
Financing																
Deht Service (Principal)	\$589.4 million															
Terms (Rate, Term)	6 50% 30	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)	(45,138)
Interest Income	5 50% /ycar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NET INCOME (LOSS)		(52,292)	(52,677)	(53,082)	(\$3.508)	(53,956)	(54,427)	(54,922)	(55,443)	(166'55)	(56,567)	(67,173)	(57,810)	(58,480)	(59,184)	(59,924)

TOFAL LISCAL IMPACT	(From Table 3)	47 575	49,954	\$2,451	55,074	57,827	60,719	63,755	66.942	70,290	73,804	77,494	81,369	85,437	89,709	94,195
NET INCOME (LOSS)		(\$2,292)	(52,677)	(51,082)	(\$3,508)	(53,956)	(54,427)	(54,922)	(55,443)	(166'55)	(56,567)	(57,173)	(57,810)	(58,480)	(59,184)	(\$9,924)
NET ECONOMIC IMPACT		(4,717)	(2,723)	(089)	1,566	3,872	6,292	8,832	11,499	14,298	17,237	20,321	23,559	26,958	30,526	34,271

# NOTES

• Financing assumes a 30 year general obligation hond issued by the Commonwealth at a 6.5°6 yield. If a revenue bond were issued.

deht service payments could be scheduled to better reflect the facility construction and lease up periods. The principal amount of

the debt equals the estimated development cost at the C Street site, inflated for two years

Interest income is carned ton the unspent portion of development funds and is based upon a negative arbitrage of 1°6.



# APPENDIX V

# HOTEL DEMAND FROM MAJOR EXPOSITION CENTER EVENTS

.

·

.

A new exposition center in Boston can be expected to bring additional convention and meeting visitors to the city and create additional demand for hotel, meals, retail sales, transportation, and other services in the city and metropolitan area. The greatest employment and fiscal benefits for Boston and Massachusetts will be those associated with hotel use. The most basic issues are: How many new hotel rooms might be developed within the city and the metropolitan area in response to increased demand from new conventions and trade shows?, and: How many additional room-sale nights will result?

# Summary of Conclusions:

A new convention / exposition facility containing an exposition hall with about 550,000 g.s.f. of exhibition space could induce the development of up to 3,259 new hotel rooms in the Boston area by the year 2010.

The fiscal yield from likely scenarios could include \$4.9 million to \$8.1 million in property tax revenues (average of \$1,500 to \$2,500/room) if these new hotels were developed in Boston and were fully taxable (i.e.: not built on Massport land.). The total amounts of state and municipal hotel occupancy taxes were estimated and described in Appendix II.

Only a portion of the net increase in hotel business and of the municipal hotel occupancy taxes that exposition center visitors generate will go to the city of Boston. Most will go to other cities and towns in the metropolitan area. Boston may receive in the range of 27% to 63% of municipal hotel room occupancy taxes arising from trade show events taking place at Boston's new Exposition Center.

The hotel demand originating from events at the new Exposition Center will not only allow for the growth of the metropolitan area's hotel stock; it will require an increase in the number of available rooms. Large events held during popular months may absorb up to one third of the metropolitan area's rooms, forcing some business or tourist visitors to reschedule or otherwise change their plans.

# Additional Demand for Hotel Rooms and New Hotel Development:

Attendance from national trade shows and related professional association gatherings (those drawing significant attendance from out of town for extended stays) was estimated at 187,641 visitors during year 2000, the first full year of operation, and 371,621 visitors by 2010, when operations stabilize at full capacity utilization, as described in Appendix I. An estimated 70% of these attendees will stay an average of 3.2 days in a Boston area hotel, as stated in Appendix II. With the average event drawing about 14,434 attendees, hotel demand for a typical large event will require (14,434 x 70% = ) 10,104 rooms each night over the entire 3.2 day period, generating 32,332 room-occupancy-nights of demand for each event. This would require 84% of Boston's current 11,966 hotel room supply , or 29% of the metropolitan area's hotel rooms (estimated at 35,000 by Smith Travel Research).

Total occupancy-days generated over the course of the year 2000 could support 1,646 hotel rooms at 70% annual occupancy if this demand were evenly distributed throughout the year. By year 2005 this theoretical maximum of hotel rooms supported by convention and trade show visitors would rise to 2,340; and by 2010, when operations stabilize at full utilization of exposition hall capacity, 3,259 hotel rooms could be supported by evenly distributed demand. (*For example:* 

,

in year 2010 our 371,621 x 0.70 x 3.2 = 832,431 hotel occupancy days of business, if evenly spread throughout the year, could support  $(832,431/(0.7 \times 365) =)$  3,259 hotel rooms at a favorable 70% occupancy rate.)

However, this demand for hotel rooms would not be evenly distributed throughout the year, and the development and utilization of hotel rooms will be influenced by the seasonality of demand and the position of Boston and its hotels in the regional market. In addition, the development of additional hotel stock will be influenced by the two general rules that: 1) no hotel may normally enjoy occupancy rates above 100% on any given day, and 2) all hotels must enjoy average annual occupancy rates of at least 65% to 70% over the long term if they are to prosper and stimulate further hotel development. Even if all new and existing hotels are full during large exposition events, additional rooms may so dilute baseline occupancy during other times that overall occupancy rates may fall below the acceptable annual average. These issues are illustrated in the following tables: *The Best Boston Can Do by Having Large Conventions in Slow Months* and *The Worst Boston Can Do by Having Large Conventions in Busy Months*.

# The scenarios illustrated in the tables go like this:

Well in advance of a large event, blocks of rooms are reserved for event attendees. Even if all or most of them could arrange to stay in Boston hotels close to the Exposition Center, they would displace numerous tourists and business visitors who have not reserved rooms as far in advance. These "normal baseline demand market" guests of Boston hotels would have to find accommodations in neighboring communities. Even if every room in Boston is filled before this displacement and spillover process begins, Boston will enjoy only the additional business equal to the number of hotel rooms that would normally be empty on this particular day. All demand in excess of this number of normally empty rooms will benefit other metropolitan area hotels. Of course, some of these displaced tourists and business travelers may be able to reschedule their stay and find accommodations in Boston when rooms here become available again, but we cannot count on this.

Against this background, the illustrated scenarios envision the development of additional hotel rooms. These new hotels cannot all be built at once, and we have already seen that the demand generated by Exposition Center guests will also be phased in as operations at the exposition center mature to full capacity and stabile operating level. So a (purely hypothetical) rational developer would want to build enough rooms so that each new hotel could experience acceptable annual occupancy (65% to 70%) if its performance equaled the market average. At the same time, city and state planners and event organizers will want to have an adequate supply of rooms to accommodate all potential visitors so that our city and region do not miss any opportunity to host all visitors at the place and time that these visitors desire.

## **RESULTS**:

Boston is already an excellent candidate for the development of additional hotels, having enjoyed a 75% average occupancy rate in 1993, with still further growth in room sales over 1994. The tables reflect this baseline situation and examine "What If" 1,646 new rooms were built in Boston now, with baseline demand increased by the projected year 2000 Exposition Center business. All of this is detailed month by month, since monthly occupancy rates show strong seasonal variation. After listing baseline demand statistics such as monthly occupancy rates and the number of occupied and available rooms on an average night, the tables look for accommodations for new Exposition Center demand. "Spillover Demand" represents the number of additional rooms



needed after every "Available Room" in the city of Boston is filled. "Convention Demand Captured ... with 1,646 New Rooms" is the sum of Available Rooms from the current (1994) stock of rooms plus the 1,646 new rooms, all of which are presumed to fill. The "% Capture" is the portion of all 10,104 rooms needed by event visitors that come from the available supply in the city of Boston, including the 1,646 new rooms. Total room nights are then calculated, and a new occupancy rate results for the enlarged stock of hotel rooms in the city.

Actual results would be somewhere between "The Best We Can Do" and "The Worst...", but probably closer to The Worst because the events in question have the same seasonal patterns as baseline demand. With 1,646 new hotel rooms, Boston would capture between 1/4 and 2/3 of the net increase in room demand.

"The Worst..." scenario points out the limitations imposed by the current size of the Boston metropolitan hotel market. On a typical October day Boston's hotels will have just over 1,000 rooms available after normal baseline demand is satisfied. The 23,000 rooms in the rest of the metropolitan area might be around 85% full, leaving only 3,500 or so rooms there empty. Adding to this the 1,646 rooms to be built under this scenario provides a total of 6,146 rooms that would be available for Exposition Center attendees, requiring the displacement or rescheduling of nearly 4,000 baseline demand hotel guests if a highly attended "mega-event" were to occur during this most popular month. However, even in this worst case Boston's overall annual occupancy rate remains in the very healthy range of 69% to 71%, indicating room in the market for still further supply growth in the city. And in fact, further hotel expansion in other cities and towns in the metropolitan area is likely also.

The need for Exposition Center activity and occupancy to grow apace with area hotel supply can be an advantage rather than a problem. The market analysis presented in this report acknowledge the need for the Exposition Center to develop its trade show market over time. The simultaneous growth of baseline supply and demand for hotel and other visitor services, along with new supply and demand coming from the Exposition Center, will increase Boston's and Massachusetts' capacity to host other major events.

An important set of issues that this purely quantitative model cannot address involves the location, price point, and type of hotels to be developed in response to Exposition Center demand. These issues are important to the further planning for the Exposition Center. For example, Boston's Downtown/Back Bay hotels are booming, with occupancy rates averaging 76% in 1993, compared to 60% to 64% for Route 128 sub-markets. Sites near downtown or between downtown and the Exposition Center are clearly the most desirable because they are proximate to this existing healthy demand as well as close to the Exposition Center itself. However, luxury and higher priced hotels such as those that now dominate Boston's downtown may not be optimally attractive to exposition event visitors nor to the additional tourists and business visitors that convention hotels will have to attract in order to maintain adequate occupancy during off weeks when no major event is taking place.

. ,

. .

update: 10/14/94 /JA The Worst Boston Can Do by having Large Conventons in Busy Months:

					Convent	tion Demand		Times	Added	Baseline	Total	New
				Current	Total	Captured	%	Number	Room	Room	Room	Occupancy
	(	Occupanc	ÿ	Rooms	Rooms	for 3.2 days	Capture	Events	Nights	Nights	Nights	Rate
		Rate		11,966	10,104	With 1,646			(3.2 night	s)		
						New Rooms	;					
	Days		Occupied	Available	Spillove	er						
			Rooms	Rooms	Demand							
Jan.	31	56%	6,713	5,253	0	0	0%			208,101	208,101	49%
Feb.	28	58%	6,904	5,062	0	0	0%			193,323	193,323	51%
March	31	67%	8,041	3,925	0	0	0%			249,276	249,276	59%
April	30	75%	8, <b>97</b> 5	2,992	0	0	0%			269,235	269,235	66%
May	31	80%	9,597	2,369	0	0	0%			297,499	297,499	71%
June	30	84%	9,992	1,974	8,130	3,620	36%	2	23,170	299,748	322,919	79%
July	31	82%	9,752	2,214	7,890	3,860	38%	2	24,702	302,321	327,023	77%
Aug.	31	88%	10,482	1,484	8,620	3,130	31%	3	30,046	324,949	354,995	84%
Sept.	30	88%	10,554	1,412	8,692	3,058	30%	3	29,357	316,620	345,977	85%
Oct.	31	92%	10,949	1,017	9,087	2,663	26%	3	25,566	339,416	364,981	86%
Nov.	30	77%	9,202	2,764	0	0	0%			276,056	276,056	68%
Dec.	31	53%	6,294	5,672	0	0	0%			195,118	195,118	46%
	365	75%					27%		132,841	3,271,660	3,404,501	69%

## update: 10/12/94 /JA

The Best Boston Can Do by Having Large Conventons in Slow Months:

					Convent	ion Demand		Times	Added	Baseline	Total	New
				Current	Total	Captured	%	Number	Room	Room	Room	Occupancy
	C	Occupanc	у	Rooms	Rooms	for 3.2 days	Capture	Events	Nights	Nights	Nights	Rate
		Rate		11,966	10,104	With 1,646			(3.2 night	s)		
						New Rooms						
	Days		Occupied	Available	Spillove	r						
			Rooms	Rooms	Demand							
Jan.	31	56%	6,713	5,253	4,851	6,909	68%	3	66,327	208,101	274,428	65%
Feb.	28	58%	6,904	5,062	5,042	6,718	66%	3	64,489	193,323	257,812	68%
March	31	67%	8,041	3,925	6,179	5,581	55%	2	35,717	249,276	284,993	68%
April	30	75%	8,975	2,992	0	0	0%			269,235	269,235	66%
May	31	80%	9,597	2,369	0	0	0%			297,499	297,499	71%
June	30	84%	9,992	1,974	0	0	0%			299,748	299,748	73%
July	31	82%	9,752	2,214	0	0	0%			302,321	302,321	72%
Aug.	31	88%	10,482	1,484	0	0	0%			324,949	324,949	77%
Sept.	30	88%	10,554	1,412	0	0	0%			316,620	316,620	78%
Oct.	31	92%	10,949	1,017	0	0	0%			339,416	339,416	80%
Nov.	30	77%	9,202	2,764	7,340	4,420	44%	2	28,289	276,056	304,345	75%
Dec.	31	53%	6,294	5,672	4,432	7,328	73%	3	70,348	195,118	265,465	63%
	365	75%					63%		265,170	3,271,660	3,536,830	71%

Source: Occupancy rates from PKF Consulting and Pinacle Advisory Group. Room stock estimates by Amatruda Assoc. Technique from Neptune Research.

7657 0.18

,

-

